(1)

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 12 2006
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 06-718

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

In Re: Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine,
Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Respondent,

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
Petitioner In Propria Persona
Sui Juris

c/o 28220 Red Raven Road
Pepper Pike, Ohio [44124]
(216) 378-9781

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I am not a member of any body politic. My Status of American (citizen) [Article 2:1:5, 1:2:3, 4:2:1 and 3:2:1 United States Constitution] and my Unalienable Rights are not negotiable.

The questions(s) presented are rooted in the organic constitution of the United States of America for the united States of America (1791). Motion to Vacate Void Judgment proceedings function is to bring to attention of the court and to obtain relief from errors of fact or because of a valid defense existing in fact but which, without negligence of defendant, was not raised either through duress, fraud or excusable mistake of such character that if known in time would have prevented rendition of judgement. Mandamus is sought to bring lower courts (tribunals) within its jurisdiction to correct acts in excess of its jurisdiction, abuse of its jurisdiction and refusal to exercise its jurisdiction.

2) Did United States state a claim against secured party creditor, and Sovereign American Nationale Inhabitant upon which relief can be granted?

3) Does the validity of an order or judgment on sentencing of a federal district court depend upon the court having jurisdiction over both the subject matter and the defendant?

4) Is Petitioner, Ambassador, Public Minister entitled to have his Petition treated as present pursuant to Supreme Court precedent the Organic Constitution for the united States of America (1791) and Title 28 U.S.C. § 1251?

5) Without subject matter jurisdiction, are all the orders

and judgments issued by a judge void under law, and of no legal force or effect?

6) Did *Savorgan v. United States* state "Although designed to apply to especially to the rights of immigrants to shed their foreign nationalities, that Act of Congress "is also broad enough to cover, and does cover, the corresponding, natural and inherent right of American citizens to expatriate themselves."

7) Is petitioner entitled to have rulings and findings of fact and law made on all of his claims?

8) Has the Supreme Court upheld that the Citizenship Act of 1907 and the Nationality Act of 1940 are to be read "in the light of policy favoring freedom of expatriation which stands unrepealed."

LIST OF PARTIES

[x] All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

[ ] All parties do not appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

LIST OF PARTIES iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES vi

OPINIONS BELOW 1

JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED 2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION 3

CONCLUSION 29

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: 8/30/06 Circuit Court Order Denying Reconsideration 1a

APPENDIX B: 6/8/06 Circuit Court Order 3a

APPENDIX C: 7/21/06 District Court Order Adopting Magistrate's Report and Recommendation 5a

APPENDIX D: 12/20/05 District Court Judgment . . 8a

APPENDIX E: Petition for Redress in the Nature of Quo Warranto 6/19/06 . . . . . 16a

APPENDIX F: Affidavit of Expatriation 22a

APPENDIX G: Asseveration and Declaration of Status 31a

APPENDIX H: Affidavit in Support of Emergency Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus 39a

APPENDIX I: Affidavit and Notice of Personal Service of Petition for Writ with Evidence, Writ of Habeas Corpus and Notice of Hearing 44a

APPENDIX J: Order for Issuance of Writ of Habeas Corpus By Higher Court Directive to Lower Court 47a

APPENDIX K: Observations and Declaration of Public Minister 49a

APPENDIX L: 7/4/06 Notice of Protest 64a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Attorney v. United States, 52 L.Ed.2d 651 . . . . . .

Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co.,
495 F.2d 906 at 910 27

Bracey v. Warden,
U.S. Supreme Court No. 96-6133 (June 9, 1997) . . . .

California v. LaRue,
400 U.S. 109, 93 S. Ct. 390, 34 L. Ed. 342 (1972) . . .

Castro v. United States, 540 U.S. 375 (2003) . . . . . .

Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States,
319 U.S. 363-371, 63 S.Ct. 573 . . . . . .

Cohens v. Virginia,
19 U.S. (6Wheat) 264, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821) . . . . . .

Cruden v. Neale, 2 S.E. 70, 2 N.C. 338 (1792) 26

Elliott v. Peirsol, 26 U.S. 328, 1 Pet 328 (1828) . . . . . .

Elk v. Wilkins, 112 U.S. 94 (1884) . . . . . .

Ferril v. Keel, 151 S.W. 269, 105 ARK. 380 (1912) . . . . .

Griffeth v. Frazier, 12 U.S. 9, 3 L.Ed. 471 (1814) 27

Hagen v. Lavine,
415 U.S. 528, 94 S. Ct. 1327, 39 L. Ed.2d 577 . . . 26

Hartford v. Davis, 13 U.S. 273, 16 S.Ct. 1051 . . . . . .

In re Jennings, 368 N.E.2d 864, 68 Ill.2d 125 (1977) . . . .

Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 58 S.Ct. 1019 (1938) . .

Kohlberg v. Leblback,
160 U.S. 293, 16 S. Ct. 304, 40 L. Ed. 432 (1895) . . .

Main v. Thiboutot, 448 U.S. 1, 100 S. Ct. 2502 26

Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) . . . . . .

Maryland v. Louisiana,
451 U.S. 725, 101 S. Ct. 2114 (1981) . . . . . .

Mitchell v. Kitsap County,
797 P.2d 516, 59 Wn. App. 1777 (1990) . . . . . .

Old Wayne Mut. L. Assoc. v. McDonough,
204 U.S. 8, 27 S.Ct. 236 (1907) . . . . . .

Rosenstiel v. Rosenstiel,
278 F. Supp. 794 (S.D.N.Y. 1967) . . . . . .

Savorgnan v. United States,
338 U.S. 491, 70 S. Ct. 292 ii

Slaughter House Cases, 83 U.S. 36 . . . . . .

Standard v. Olsen,
74 S.Ct. 768, 98 L.Ed. 1151 (1954) 27

Stoll v. Gottlieb,
305 U.S. 171, 59 S. Ct. 134, 83 L. Ed. 104 (1938) . . .

United States v. Cotton, 535 U.S. 625 . . . . . .

United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 . . . . . .

United States v. Nevers, 7 F.3d 59 (5th Cir. 1993) . . . . . .

United States v. Perkins,
16 S. Ct. 1073, 163 U.S. 625 . . . . . .

United States v. Peter, 310 F.3d 709 (11th cir. 2002) . . . .

United States v. Siviglia, 686 F.2d 832 (1981) 27

United States v. Will,
449 U.S. 200, 101 S.Ct. 471, 66 L.Ed. 392 (1980) . . .

Valley v. Northern Fire & Marin Ins. Co.,
254 U.S. 348, 41 S.Ct. 116 (1920) . . . . . .

Walter Briehl v. John Foster Dulles, 284 F.2d 561 16

Williamson v. Berry, 8 How. 495, 12 L.Ed. 1170 (1850) . .

Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 O.S. 356 12

STATUTES AND RULES

5 U.S.C. § 556 (d) and 552(b) 2, 27

8 U.S.C.A. § 1481(a)(2) 2, 16

8 U.S.C.A. § 1185 2

18 U.S.C. § 241 2

18 U.S.C. § 242 2

22 U.S.C. § 1731 2

22 U.S.C. § 1732 2

22 U.S.C. § 2201 2

28 U.S.C. § 1251 . . . . . i, 2

28 U.S.C. § 1746(1) 2, 24

Section 1999 of the Revised Statutes of the U.S. 2

Statutes at Large 122 . . . . . 2, 9

15 U.S. Statutes at Large, 223, 224
Chap.249 (1868) 2, 16, 24

Statutes at Large 298 . . . . . 2, 9

2 U.S. Statutes at Large 613 2

Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) . . . . . *passim*

OTHER

41st Congress, Session III, Chapter 62 (1871) 6, 7

Amended Bill of Rights (1791) 2

Citizenship Act of 1907, L.Ed. 338 U.S. 498-499 ii

Declaration of Independence (1776) 9

Nationality Act of 1940, 70 S.Ct. 296 ii

United States Constitution (1789) 2, 9

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[ ] For cases from **federal courts:**

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A the petition and is

[x] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix C the petition and is

[x] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

[x] For cases from **federal courts:**

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was June 8, 2006.

[x] A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: September 1, 2006, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix A.

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The relevant statutory provisions are: 5 U.S.C. § 556 (d) and 553(b), 8 U.S.C.A. § 1481(a)(2), 8 U.S.C.A. § 1185, 18 U.S.C. § 241, 18 U.S.C. § 242, 22 U.S.C. § 1731, 22 U.S.C. § 1732, 22 U.S.C. § 2201, 28 U.S.C. § 1251, 28 U.S.C. § 1746(1), Section 1999 of the Revised Statutes of the U.S., Statutes at Large 122, Statutes at Large 298, 2 U.S. Statutes at Large 613, United States Constitution and Amendment (1791). Bill of Rights, Fed.R.Civ.P. 60(b), 15 U.S. Stat. at Large 223, 224 Chap. 249 (1868).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

In the complete absence of any verified Oath or Affirmation made by a non-participant INHABITANT, pledging Himself and/or His property-rights to certain specified performance, subject matter jurisdiction does not exist; and in the complete absence of proving a lawful and verified complain made against such non-participant INHABITANT, where in a Real Party claims a damage, no criminal jurisdiction exists; ... thus in the complete absence of proving either IN PERSONAM and or SUBJECT MATTER jurisdiction, governmental jurisdiction of the non-participant INHABITANT does not exist, QUAD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM (emphasis added).

That any and all alleged instrument(s) charging any non-participant to the people and My self, in any instant action, is defective on its face, void ab initio in that My true Appellation spelled in proper upper and lower case lettering: Anthony-Lewis:Jerdine, identifying My self as a natural free-born American (not a corporation member thereto) DOES NOT appear, as by right, and as suchio required, and has

been recently recognized in the Western Washington, United States District Court, which has specifically articulated, "In any action at law, it is a requirement, that a party's true (appellation) be spelled in proper and lower case letters."

I do not know if I am a party to any instant actions; I have never been informed as to the nature and cause, specifically what venue, and jurisdiction of any alleged charging instrument; nor of any damage(s) or injur(ies) to a real natural free-born American (not some corporation of its members)

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

My true name is Anthony-Lewis, my Family's name is Jerdine. I herein know all men by these presents: Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family. I am a natural free-born American, Sui Juris, De Jure Soli Jure Divino. I am a private man of God on the land. Anthony- Lewis is an Ambassador of Sovereign American Nationale. Anthony- Lewis, enjoys complete and absolute diplomatic immunity at all times. Anthony-Lewis has never knowingly, willingly, intentionally, nor voluntarily consented to be stripped of his dejure status. Anthony-Lewis, out of necessity, has made Known his dejure status in a timely and effective manner, in the spirit of good faith, with clean hands of which the world witnessed by Lawful Public Notice to the world titled " Asseveration and Declaration of Status" and "Notice and Affidavit of Default"

I have always upheld the authority of the Republic form of Government within The united States of America, forward by "the people." I have never declared war against any Dejure or Republic Form of Government. I cannot find my true Appellation on any paper matter reviewed being of a contractual nature and or instrument of any kind from the US District Court for the Southern District of Florida. In all

courts of limited jurisdiction, the record of the case must support any claim of subject matter jurisdiction.

The District Courts judgment is **VOID** for want of Subject- matter and in personam jurisdiction, due to lack of proper service of process, properl, naming/substituting **proper parties**, and presentment of Indictment of a Grand Jury. The law provides that once Federal jurisdiction has been challenged, it **must** be proven.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Comes now, Anthony-Lewis, in the above captior ed Court and Petitions for the issuance of a writ of Mandamus against UNITED STATES OF AMERICA to compel discharge of all alleged obligations by UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and to procure the immediate release of Anthony-Lewis, from custody of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Please find herein attached an Affidavit in support of Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, of age to contract and competent to witness, states that the facts contained herein are true, correct, first hand knowledge and belief under the penalty of perjury pursuant to the Laws of Ohio state and the united States of America.

1. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, having standing in Law to sustain the above attached Petition for Writ of Mandamus, understands the penalty of perjury.

2. Affiant herein knows all men by these presents: Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family.

3. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis is an Ambassador of Sovereign American Nationale.

4. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, enjoys complete and absolute diplomatic immunity at all times.

5. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis has not been served Notice of any alleged charges, nor convicted of any crime.

6. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, has never knowingly, willingly, intentionally, nor voluntarily consented to be stripped of his de jure status.

7. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, is not nor has ever been a member of any corporate or political body to the United States and its Franchise/License of STATE OF FLORIDA and or any STATE(S) of, or territories, nor of any extensions of the United States.

8. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, has always inhabited a Foreign venue to United States, STATE OF FLORIDA, and/or to any STATE(S) of.

9. The Corpus of Anthony-Lewis, Affiant, has been seized, transported and under continued seizure of UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and/or by officer(s), agent(s), assign(s), or successor(s) thereof.

10. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, has not been provided with any verifiable, Lawful evidence of Lawful authority and/or jurisdiction for the seizure of Anthony-Lewis.

11. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, out of necessity, has made known his de jure status in a timely and effective manner, in the spirit of good faith, with clean hands of which the world witnessed by Lawful Public Notice to the world entitled "Asseveration and Declaration of Status" and "Notice and Affidavit of Default", incorporated herein by reference as if fully reproduced.

12. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, has placed Condoleeza Rice, Fiduciary, Office of Secretary of State, United States (41st Congress, Sess. III, CH 62, 1871), Washington, District of Columbia, and Alberto Gonzales, Fiduciary, Office of Attorney General/United States Bar Association member representative, United States (41st Congress, Sess. III, CH 62, 1871), Washington District of Columbia, upon NOTICE of breach of fiduciary Duties by officer(s) and agent(s) of your Corporate Governing bodies, under the Franchise License under which UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is operating as a corporation herein by reference as if fully reproduced.

13. Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, served certified copies of "Asseveration and Declaration of Status" upon Jim Petro, Attorney General for STATE OF OHIO/Ohio State Bar Association member representative, J. Kenneth Blackwell Secretary of State for STATE OF OHIO, all of which have the power to prevent or correct the unlawful and continuing seizure of the corpus of Anthony-Lewis, and failed or refused to prevent or correct the unlawful and continuing seizure of the corpus of Anthony-Lewis.

14. All parties in enumeration #13 are in Breach of Fiduciary Duties, the performance of which is incorporated into the Oath of Office contract(s), performance of which is secured by the Official Bond(s) or surety(s) to compel the performance in good faith of their acting in Official capacity, under color of the law(s), policies(s), and custom(s) of the United States and/or officer/agent of STATE OF OHIO by way of membership to Ohio State Bar Association and contrary to the principles of law articulated herein.

15. All parties in enumeration #13 have failed or refused to initiate and secure the liberty of the corpus of Anthony-Lewis, showing bad faith, willful, wanton, and reckless disregard of Law and any Oath(s) taken leaving Affiant no alternative but to seek judgment against the Official Bond(s) or surety(s)_ of all said parties up to complete forfeiture.

16. All parties listed in enumeration #13 have failed to act, pursuant to the principles of Law articulated in the nature of your United States Code [Title 18, Section 4], having actual NOTICE and knowledge of the true appellation and Foreign Status of Affiant, Anthony-Lewis.

17. In the nature of the Law as articulated in the United States Constitution, as adopted by laws of the municipal corporate government of the District of Columbia known as United States (41st Congress, Sess. III, Ch 62, 1871) in Article III, Section 2, states that:

"In all cases affecting Ambassadors, or other public Ministers and Counsels. . .the supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction. . ."

18. In observance of the ultimate facts stipulated in enumeration #17 and in relation to Anthony-Lewis, an Ambassador of Sovereign American Nationale, only the supreme Court of the United States can issue forth lawful NOTICE OF SERVICE of any charges against Affiant, Anthony-Lewis.

19. The facts stipulated here preclude UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and any officer(s), agent(s), assign(s), or successor(s) thereof from ever possessing Lawful authority and/or jurisdiction over Affiant herein, in relation to seizure of Anthony-Lewis, Affiant.

20. To this day, Affiant, Anthony-Lewis, has not received NOTICE OF SERVICE to answer allegations or charges, nor has been Indicted by the GRAND JURY of the supreme Court of the United States.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT

REMEDY SOUGHT

Affiant, Anthony-Lewis having shown the extraordinary circumstances Affiant has been forced to endure, seeks remedy from the court of original jurisdiction, to issue forth against UNITED STATES OF AMERICA and agent(s), assign(s), thereof, a Writ of Mandamus to initiate, secure and compel the immediate discharge of all alleged obligations, release from custody, and the return of all private and personal property of and belonging to Anthony - Lewis.

MOTION TO VACATE VOID JUDGMENT
[Pursuant to "FRCiP" 60(b) (4)]
codified in Title 28 U.S.C. § 1651 (Ex Parte)

"THE COURT SHALL TAKE JUDICIAL NOTICE"

Anthony-Lewis

One of the free people of the several, freely associated, compact, united States of America; the Declaration of Independence of 1776 C.E.; the Northwest Ordinance, 1787 C.E.; the Constitution of the united States of America, 1789 C.E., as amended by the Bill of Rights, 1791 C.E.; and the Florida State Constitution, 1838 C.E.

1. Statutes at Large 122
2. Statutes at Large 298

I. IDENTIFICATION OF MOVING PARTY

By Special Visitation, I Anthony-Lewis, sui juris, of the Jerdine Family, am the Movant (hereinafter referred to as "I, My and Secured Party/Plaintiff,') in the above-entitled action and, do **DECLARE** the following:

A. Secured Party/Plaintiff is a Natural Born Free, Inhabitant, an American Citizen by birth, of the several sovereign state Republics of the Grand American Union; known as the united States of America respectively. I am sojourning in Ohio republic, of a transient nature to the **UNITED STATES, STATE OF OHIO** and or any **"STATE OF"**, created and endowed by our Creator: the One Supreme Being, with unalienable rights as articulated in the Constitutions of the United States for the united States of

America. My jurisdiction is My Sovereign Domain and My Flag is the American Flag of Peace.

B. Secured Party/Plaintiff has never knowingly, willfully, intentionally, or voluntarily waived any of these unalienable rights. I stand My Self, with Assistance, Special, sui juris with Judicial Power, and non-assumpsit to any de facto STATE or state. I am not a member of any body politic. My status of American (Citizen) [Article 2:1:5, 1:2:3, 4:2:1, and 3:2:1 U.S. Const.], and my Unalienable Rights are not negotiable.

C. Secured Party/Plaintiff is not a subject of, or to the United States Constitution, its Ordinances, Statutes, Codes, or Regulations; or subject of, or to the Executive, Legislative, nor Judicial jurisdiction of its Actors, Agents, Officers, Employees, or Elected Officials of Government, as defined as Corporate.

II. STATUS OF SECURED PARTY/PLAINTIFF

A. Secured Party/plaintiff is currently being held against his will in the location of the **BUREAU OF PRISONS** pursuant to an unconstitutional Judgment. See, "Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Vacate Void Judgment."

B. Secured Party/Plaintiff; a creation only of the One Supreme Being: Creator, Free Agent, being a subject, slave or peon to none, have never, knowingly, willfully, intentionally, or voluntarily given My power of attorney, appointment, of Sovereign Status to any party. See "Sovereignty Established" in Section III of this Motion;

C. Secured Party/Plaintiff is also a Secured Party/Creditor to ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE© **(DEBTOR),** or **any** variations or derivatives thereof or therefrom, in **any** form.

D. Secured Party/Plaintiff is the Holder-In-Due-Course by recorded Security Agreement, and **controls a Superior Priority Claim** over **ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE© (DEBTOR),** or **any** variations or derivatives thereof or therefrom, in **any** form.

E. Secured Party/plaintiff is the Record Owner and Principal Party-of-Interest of the Trade Name(s): **ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE© (DEBTOR),** or **any** variations or derivatives thereof or therefrom, in **any** form.

III. SOVEREIGNTY ESTABLISHED

Sovereignty defined: The Sovereign is a non-juristic Inhabitant, being a member of "We The People." All of the Sovereign's Rights come from GOD, not the State. The Sovereign does not qualify as a 'person' as defined by Law (Statutes). The Sovereign is Independent, self-governing and lawful.

The Term "sovereign," and to this particular extent, means "property" and "Creation of the Supreme Being" herein, being the Secured Party/Plaintiff's body, mind and all of his possessions and ownership and control thereof.

> "The people of the state are entitled to all rights which formally belonged to the King at his prerogative." *Lansing v. Smith*, [21 D.89 (New York S.C. 1829)].

> "Under our system, the People, who are there [in England} called subjects, are here the sovereign. Their Rights, whether collective or individual, are not bound to give way to sentiment of loyalty to the person of monarch. The Citizen* here [in America] knows no person, however near those in power, or however powerful himself to whom he need yield their rights which the Law secures to him." *United Sates v. Lee*, [106 U.S. 204 (March 3rd. 1889)]

In *Kansas v. Colorado*, 206 U.S. 46 (1909), the U.S. Supreme Court clearly recognized the three sovereigns as (1) the United States, as the federal Government, (2) the State Government(s), and (3) **"We The People."**

> "While sovereign powers are delegated to...the government, sovereignty itself **remains with the people**," *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, [188 U.S. 356, at 370 (1886)] Emphasis added.

It is also contended, and at issue, that the sovereign **"We The People,"** cannot be named as merely "person," or "any person," in statute, but must be specified within the language of the statute, as stated in *Will v. Michigan State Department of State Police*, [491 U.S. 58, 105 L.Ed.2d 45, 109 S.Ct. 2304 (1989)]:

> "The term 'person' does not include the 'sovereign' and for the sovereign to be bound to that statute, the 'sovereign' must be specifically named."

More importantly, this Secured Party/Plaintiff has **DECLARED** and **CERTIFIED** his Birthright on the Public Record, although it is true that this Secured Party/Plaintiff has always been a Sovereign and is now being asserted. It should

also be noted, that this Secured Party/Plaintiff is an American Citizen, as defined in the United States Constitution for the *u*nited States of America, Article II, Section I, clause 5, not a "United States citizen," Article I, Section 2, clause 12. *See Chisholm v. Georgia*, [2 Dall. 418, 471 (1792)].

IV. STATEMENT OF ISSUES

The underlying cause for the ***"EX* PARTE MOTION TO VACATE VOID JUDGMENT"** is predicated upon the procedural and constitutional negligence of this Court, as follows:

A. The US ATTORNEYS OFFICE, in the instant case, failed to secure a formal Complaint, signed and sworn to, from an Injured Party/Victim; or a Contract requiring specific performance, bearing the True Name and 'bona-fide' signature of this aggrieved Secured party/Plaintiff, from a Holder-In-Due-Course of any Equity, Admirality, Maritime, International, or Statutory Court.

B. Whereas no Complaint, signed and sworn to, by an Injured Party/Victim, or a Contract requiring specific performance lodged by a Holder-In-Due-Course, bearing the True Name and 'bona-fide' signature of this Aggrieved Secured Party/plaintiff, and placed into evidence on the Court record, amounts to a constitutional violation of the Rights to Life, Liberty, and Property, without Due Process of Law.

C. This Aggrieved Secured party/Plaintiff was arrested, seized and imprisoned without due process of Law, under color of law and office, for the sole purpose of being held to account for an alleged infamous crime,

> without the **proper** parties named and substituted and presentment or indictment returned by a duly constituted Grand Jury. In addition, the Constitutional right to a Grand Jury was not waived prior to, or at any time during the proceedings.

These failures are illegal, arbitrary and capricious disregard for their very nature and constitute violations of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments to the United States Constitutions for the united States of America and Article I, Section 2, 29, thereby, divesting the **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA** of jurisdiction to act on this Sovereign, aggrieved Secured Party/Plaintiff.

V. JURISDICTION/VENUE

This Secured Party/Plaintiff is without the legislative venue and jurisdiction of the **UNITED STATES**, and or any alleged federal Territory, and or any alleged Commercial admiralty, maritime, and or some other venue/jurisdiction foreign to my nature, in accord with Article Ten (10) of the Bill of Rights, 1791 A.D.:

> "In view of the Tenth Amendment's reminder that powers not delegated to the Federal Government, nor prohibited to the States are reserved to be State or to the People. The existence of expressed limitations on State Sovereignty may equally imply that caution should be exercised before concluding that unstated limitations on State power were intended by the framers." *John H. Alden et al. Petitioners v. Maine*, [(98 436) 715 A.2d 172 (June 23rd 1999, Justice Kennedy, Supreme Court of the United States)]; citing, *City of Boerne v. Flores*, [521 U.S. 506, at 507

(1997)]; *see also United States v. Lopez*, [514 U.S. 549, at 552 (1995)]; and *Martin v. Hunter's Lessee*, [1 Wheat 304, at 326 (1816)].

"The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Ref. U.S. Const., Art. III.

"The judicial Power shall extend to all cases...Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; to Controversies... Between a State... and foreign... Citizens..." ref. U.S. Const., Art. III, See. two, cl.2.

"In all Cases...in which a State shall be a party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction." Ref. U.S. Const., Art. III, See. two, cl.2.

Under the provisions of authority in the Constitution, the congress with such Exception did ordain and establish, vesting judicial Power in such inferior court: United States Supreme Court (private).

"This Constitution,... shall be the supreme Law of the land; and judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution...to the Contrary notwithstanding." Ref.: U.S. Const., Art. VI, cl.2.

"...All executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;" ref.: U.S. Const., Art. VI, l. 3.

Secured Party/Plaintiff invokes "Sovereign Immunity" in accord with the "Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act" of October 21st, 1976 C.E., [H.H. 11315] Public Law 94-583, 94th Congress, 90 Statutes at large § 1 and 15 Statutes at large, Chap. 149-25, pp. 223-224 § 1, R.S. 1990. Title Eight, United States Code, section one thousand four hundred eighty-one [Title 8 U.S.C. § 1481] is still in force and effect today. *See Briehl v. Dulles*, [248 F2d 561, at 543 n n.21], among others.

Nothing in the "International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights" (hereinafter "ICCPR"), 102nd Congress, 2nd Sessions, Exec. Rept. 103-23, January 23rd, 1992, requires legislation, or other action, by the united States of America, prohibited by the Constitution for the united States of America, as interpreted by the United States. See ICCPR, pg. 24. This means that the restrictions of the Constitution do come into effect when they are applied by a Sovereign American of one of the several compact States of the Union, and everything that State's Agents, Actors, Officers, Employees, or Elected Officials attempt to do to a Sovereign American with presentments, e.g. attached "Information (initial); Affidavit of Probable Cause; Statement of facts; Amended Information (primary and secondary); Judgment & Sentence; and Warrant of Commitment," is null and void.

VI. LEGAL AUTHORITY

This "Motion To Vacate Void Judgment" is presented in accord with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure [hereinafter "FRCi9P"), Rule 60(b) (4)] as codified in Title Twenty-eight, United States Code, section one thousand six hundred fifty-one [Title 28 U.S.C. § 1651]. **The Judgment is void**. See "Memorandum Of Law In Support Of Motion To Vacate

Void Judgment" for further statements and authority, attached.

This "Motion to Vacate Void Judgment" is timely, as there is *no time limit* where the Court lacked/lacks jurisdiction.

> "there is no time limit on [FRCiP Rule 60(b) (4)] attack on judgment as void, one-year limit applicable to some [FRCiP Rule 60(b) motions is **expressly inapplicable**, and **requirement that motion be made within 'reasonable time' cannot be enforced with regard to [FRCiP 60(b) motion."** *New York Life Insurance Co. v. Brown*, [84 F3d 137 (54 Cir. 1996)] (emphasis added).

Furthermore, this Court is compelled to provide appropriate relief under auspices of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure [Rule 60(b) (4)], as codified in Title Twenty-eight, United States Code, section one thousand six hundred fifty-one [Title 28 U.S.C., section 1651], where judgment is void.

> "If underlying judgment is void, it is per se abuse of discretion for district court to deny movant's motion to vacate void judgment [under FRCiP 60(b) (4)]." *Antonie v. Atlas Turner, Inc.*, [66 F3d 105 (6th Cir. 1995)].

This Court's judgment is **void** for want of subject-matter and in personam jurisdiction, due top lack of proper service of process, properly naming/substituting **proper parties,** and presentment of Indictment of a Grand Jury. *See*, attached "Memorandum Of Law In Support Of Motion To Vacate Void Judgment.

VII. DUTY OF THE COURT

It is the duty of this court to act upon this "Motion To Vacate Void Judgment," since it originated in this court and it should have recognized the Constitutional violations that occurred, and that have been presented herein, and that were allowed to occur, either through neglect, mistake, inadvertence or other means, to this Sovereign American, Secured Party/Plaintiff's detriment. Further, it is well within this Court's authority to make right that which is wrong.

All judges are bound to comply with the Constitution for the united States of America and all its Treaties entered into.

> "This Constitution, and laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof, and all the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding" U.S. Const. Art. VI, cl. 2.

> "States may not, in the name of local control over local laws and practice, give state courts the power to violate the supreme law of the land." *Kalb v. Feuersterin*, [308 U.S. 433, at 439, 84 L.Ed. 370, 374, 60 S.Ct. 343, 41 Am. Bank. Rep. N.S. 501 (Wis. 1940)].

VIII. RELIEF SOUGHT & CONCLUSION

I Anthony-Lewis, Sui Juris, the Secured Party/Plaintiff herein, Sovereign American and Undersigned, with standing to present this "Motion To Vacate Void Judgment," based on

the above mentioned statements of fact and accompanying authority.

This Court did knowingly and willingly, allow UNITED STATES OF AMERICA to proceed against this Secured Party/Plaintiff Sovereign, committing a **malfeasance of justice**, through negligence, inadvertence, or other means to secure and present the Proper Parties, e.g. "The United States of America, corpus delecti, substituted defendant" etc., serve proper service of process on presentment or Indictment of a duly constituted Grand Jury, contrary to both Constitutions for the united States of America and for Florida republic. This Court did, in fact, "charge" ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE©, a Debtor (hereinafter and in any context relating to any action **"DEBTOR"**), a governmentally created **Fiction**, Ens Legis, existing for commercial purposes only, existing in contemplation of law, and non-existent. See Attachments and "Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion To Vacate Void Judgment."

This Court used **DECEIT** to mislead this Secured Party/Plaintiff, Creator, Natural Born Free Inhabitant upon the soil into believing the Court was moving against this Sovereign American. But, regardless of this **Fact**, proper service of process **has** never been served upon **any** party.

REMEDY:

That the Non-participant of the people, known to all men by these presents: Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family be immediately discharged from the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS FCI-ELKTON; and to cease and desist all deprivations of Life, Liberty, and pursuit of Happiness against the above named

Non-participant of the people, man of God on the Land, being a natural free-born American inhabitant.

NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT
AND
NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL.

Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion to Vacate Void Judgement

Memorandum of Law
Verification

Columbia county)
The State of Ohio) Verified Writ
united States of America)

Petitioning Plaintiff, Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family, states that the facts contained herein are true, correct, complete, and not misleading to the best of my first hand knowledge and belief under penalty of perjury to the Laws of The united States of America.

1. My true name is Anthony-Lewis.

2. My Family's name is Jerdine.

3. I herein know all men by these present: Anthony-Lewis and Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine Family.

4. I am a nature free-born American, Sui Juris, De Jure Soli, Jure Divino.

5. I enjoy all Rights given to "the people" from Nature and Nature's God: The creator; and as

articulated in the Magna Charta, Articles of Confederation, Declaration of Independence, Constitution for The united States of America, Bill of Rights, Amendment: Articles I through X, hereinafter "Organic Documents."

6. I am a private man of God on the Land.

7. I exercise ministerial, and Judicial Power as granted to "the people" from Nature's God: The Creator.

8. I am here by "SPECIAL VISITATION" to correct the United States District Court - Southern District of Florida and record, to prevent the continuing irreparable harm, wrongs, and injuries to My self.

9. I enter on the court record this "MOTION TO VACATE VOID JUDGEMENT", QUO WARRANTO", "MOTION FOR DISCHARGE", in a Timely manner, with clean hands and with a spirit of good faith.

10. I have reviewed all paper matter put before Me that have the appearance of lawful authority from the United States District Court - southern district of Florida.

11. I have not prepared, nor participated in the preparation of, nor participated in preparation of similar paper, matter from the United States District Court - southern district of Florida and cannot find My true Christian name, on any of the paper matter issued from this colerable court.

12. I, never having been informed with full knowledge and disclosure in regards to any alleged paper matter from the United States District Court - southern district of Florida, have NO understanding and am extremely confused.

13. I cannot find My true Appellation on any of the paper matter reviewed from the United States District Court-southern district of Florida in Regards to: UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE, Inc. Cause No. 05-20251-CR-GOLD and 06-20063-CIV-MARTINEZ.

14. I cannot find My true Appellation on any paper matter reviewed, being of a contractual nature, and or instrument of any kind from the United States District Court-southern district of Florida.

15. I cannot find where "the people" or My self gave lawful authority on any paper matter reviewed from the United States District Court-southern district of Florida, and or any nexus of authority, and or any consent of any kind to be deprived of Life, Liberty, and property.

16. I HEREBY recognize and declare that Nature and Nature's God: The One True God and Creator; and his Law reigning Supreme is My Law and internal guide during My 'SPECIAL VISITATION", and I have broken no Law.

17. I have never declared apolitical affiliation to any de facto form of government, and or otherwise separate from "the people".

18. I have always upheld the authority of the Republic Form of Government within The united States of America, for and by "the people."

19. I have never declared War against any De Jure, or Republic Form of Government.

20. I remain a natural free-born American, Sui Juris, De Jure Solis, Jure Divino, who is traveling through a perpetual Neutral Zone.

21. I have always maintained My Sovereign Status shared with the people.

22. I, being of a Neutral Nature, am "**Guaranteed Safe Passage**" in International Law, through all Declared and Undeclared War Zones.

23. I have never been a member of any de facto form of government.

24. I have never been a member of any corporation or enfranchised at any time.

25. I have never informed with full knowledge and disclosure at any time, and or the recipient of any benefits or beneficiary to any statutory Trust, thereby becoming a tort feasor, or liable to a specific performance to some unknown 'Trustee' or any Type of Trust.

26. I am a natural free-born American, Sovereign, Sui Juris, De Jure Soli, Jure Divino; sent into this world through Nature and nature's God, to inhabit the body of flesh, bone and blood: The Creator's

Temple; to command with absolute authority, and complete diplomatic immunity, the Natural and Unalienable Rights guaranteed to God's people.

27. I further reserve ALL "EXPLICIT RIGHTS" pursuant to the Uniform Commercial Code [§§ 1-207, 1-103], and "without the United States" pursuant to United States Code, Title Twenty-eight, Section one thousand seven hundred forty-six, paragraph one [T 28 U.S.C., § 1746 (1)].

28. It is herewith **CERTIFIED** that pursuant to Fifteen [15] Statutes at Large, Chapter two hundred forty-nine section one [Ch. 249, § 1], enacted on the twenty-seventh day of July, in the year one thousand eight hundred sixty-eight, among others' Being of a Sovereign Nature, I am of American Heritage, enjoying complete and absolute diplomatic immunity. I am Incapacitated and immune to Statute(s), and My Sovereign Status shared with the people is foreign to title(s) associated with: "beneficiary", "chattel", "citizen" "subject", "resident", "person" [artificial], "tax payer", "voter", "servant", "slave", "peon", and or any other Title(s) under statute(s) of the United States, Corporate United States, not excluding any enfranchised member of Corporate United States, such as "STATE OF FLORIDA" and or any "STATE(S) OF."

29. My venue is now, and always has been foreign to the United States, Corporate United States, and ALL its enfranchised members, such as "STATE OF FLORIDA" and or any "STATE(S) OF."

30. I herein exercise and preserve ALL My Unalienable Rights derived from Nature and Nature's God, and declare that I am forever civilly dead.

31. This Motion to Vacate Void Judgement: Being a Constitutional Entity operates in accordance with the following provision and United States Supreme Court ruling(s) and others.

Take Judicial Notice of the following:

"The judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Ref. U.S. Const., Art III, Section one.

The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases... Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party; to Controversies...Between a State...and foreign... Citizens..." ref U.S. Const., Art. III, Section two.

"In all Cases...in which a State shall be a Party, the supreme Court shall have original Jurisdiction." ref.: U.S. Const., Art. III, Sec. Two, cl. 2.

If the people and My self are not subject to any Constitutional jurisdictions, nor subject to any enactment made by any Constitutionally Created Legislature; then the people and My self are also not subject to any jurisdiction presumed by any Constitutionally Created Executive Branch of Government; and the people are not subject to any jurisdiction presumed, made by any Constitutionally Created Judiciary.

In the complete of any Lawful and verified Oath or Affirmation made by a Non-participant of the people and My self, to support any Constitution; and or in the complete absence of proving a Higher Title to that property known and described as a Non-participant of the people and My self, In personam Jurisdiction DOES NOT, NOR HAS EVER EXISTED; and in complete absence of proving lawful and Voluntary contract made by such Non-participant to the people pledging My self and or My Property-Rights to a certain specified performance, Subject Matter Jurisdiction DOES NOT, NOR HAS EVER EXISTED; and in the complete absence of any Lawful and verified complaint made against such Non-participant of the people and My self, wherein a real Injured Party Claims a Damage, NO CRIMINAL JURISDICTION EXISTS; thus, in complete absence of proving the existence of neither: In Personam and or Subject Matter Jurisdiction, any alleged and or presumed jurisdiction by any form of government over a Non-participant of the people and My self, DOES NOT, and HAS NEVER EXISTED. Quod Erat Demonstrandum.

"By being a part of the society...they [the people] had not entered into any engagement to become subject to any...form [of government] the majority might think proper to adopt. That the majority shall prevail is a posterior to the form of government, and the results from it. **It is not a rule binding upon mankind's natural state. There, every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions form by his fellow men without his consent."** *Cruden v. Neale* [2 N.C. 338 (1792) 2 S.E. 70], Emphasis Added.

"The law provides that once State and Federal jurisdiction has been challenged, it must be proven", *Main v. Thiboutot* [100 S. Ct 2502 (1980)]; *Hagen v. Lavine* [415 U.S. 533].

"Where there is absence of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity, and confer no right, offer no justification, and may be rejected upon direct collateral attach." *Thompson v. Tolmie* [17 L.Ed. 381 91829)]; *Griffeth v. Frazier* [3 L.Ed. 471, 12 U.S. 9 (1814)]. "No sanctions can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction", *Standard v. Olsen* [74 S.Ct. 768, 98 L.Ed. 1151 (1954)]; Title Five United States Code, Section five hundred-fifty eight-b [T 5 U.S.C., § 558(b)]. "The proponent of the rule has the burden of proof" Title Five United States Code, Section five hundred fifty-six-d [T 5 U.S.C., § 556(d)]. "Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, even on **final determination**", *Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co.* [495 F.2d 906, at 910] Emphasis Added.

The people and My self "**squarely challenge**" any alleged and presumed jurisdiction asserted against a Non-participant of the people and My self, by the United States District Court - southern district of Florida; in regards to any instant action associated with UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE, Inc. No. 05-20251-CR-GOLD. "Uncertain things are held for nothing", Maxim of Law; "the law requires, not conjecture, but certainty", *Coffin v. Ogden* [85 U.S. 120, 124]; "where the law is uncertain, there is no law", Bouvier's Vol. 2, Maxims, 1880 Edition. "when any court violates the clean and unambiguous language of the Constitution, a fraud is perpetrated and no one is bound to obey it", *State v. Sullen* [63 Minn. 167, 65 N.M. 262, 30 LRA 630]. "A court lacking jurisdiction cannot render judgment, but must dismiss the cause at any stage of proceedings in which it becomes apparent that jurisdiction is lacking", *United States v. Siviglia* [686 F.2d 832, 835 (1981)], cases cited, Emphasis Added.

Based on the foregoing and attached hereto: Declaration in the Nature of an Affidavit of Necessity, any Non-Participant of the people and My self, should by QUO WARRANTO have all such other(s) bringing any instant action: criminal or civil against the people and My self, to aver with particularity and generally to the absolute lack of In Personam and Subject Matter Jurisdiction, based on the herein judicial facts in law; and the Office of Attorney General and Secretary of State for The State of Florida, STATE OF FLORIDA, Expressed Affirmations to My complete and absolute diplomatic immunity, the matter forever settled, res judicata; and or show cause as to why such instant action of an unknown nature, venue, jurisdiction, no real Injury and or Damaged party, is not in accordance with the Social Contract or Compact within the jurisdiction of any purported offense or charge.

CONCLUSION TO WIT:

That any and all alleged instrument(s) charging any Non-participant to the people and My self, in any instant action, is defective on its face, void ab initio in that My true Appellation spelled in proper upper and lower case lettering: Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine, identifying My self as a nature free-born American (not a corporation member thereto) DOES NOT appear, as by right, and as such is required, and has been recently recognized in the Western Washington, United States District Court, which has specifically articulated, "In any action at law, it is a requirement that a party's true (appellation) be spelled in proper upper and lower case letters."

I do not know if I am a party to any instant actions; I have never been informed as to the nature and cause, specifically what venue, and jurisdiction of any alleged charging

instrument; nor of any damage(s) or injur(ies) to a real natural free-born American (not some corporation or one of its members).

REMEDY:

That the Non-participant of the people, known to all men by these presents: Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family be immediately discharged from the United States of American, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, BUREAU OF PRISONS FCI-ELKTON; to cease and desist all deprivations of Life, Liberty, and pursuit of Happiness against the above named Non-participant of the people, man of God on the Land, being a natural free-born American.

FURTHER SAYETH I NAUGHT

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine, Sui Juris
De Jure Soli, Jure Divino
c/o 28220 Red Raven Road
Pepper Pike, Ohio [44124]

Petitioner In Propria Persona
Sui Juris

Date: November 17, 2006

APPENDIX A

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-11534-G
Dist. Ct. Docket No. 05-20251-CR-ASG

[Filed August 30, 2006]

IN RE:	)
	)
ANTHONY L. JERDINE,	)
	)
Petitioner.	)
	)

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the
United States District Court for the
Southern District of Florida

BEFORE: ANDERSON and BARKETT, Circuit Judges.

ORDER

Anthony L. Jerdine, a *pro se* federal prisoner, moves for reconsideration of this Court's June 8, 2006 order denying his petition for writ of mandamus. We held that Jerdine had an adequate alternative remedy because he could have appealed his conviction and sentence. In addition to his motion for reconsideration, Jerdine also has filed the following unsolicited documents: (1) memorandum of law in support of

motion to reconsider; (2) petition for redress in nature of *quo warranto*; (3) asservation and declaration of status; (4) writ of error *coram nobis*; (5) *a priori* notice of appointment of public minister; and (6) petition for writ of mandamus. In those documents, Jerdine further details his arguments made in his motion for reconsideration, namely, that the district court did not have jurisdiction over him as the government failed to issue a proper indictment. Jerdine requests that this Court order his release from custody. As an initial matter, we construe all of Jerdine's various unsolicited filings collectively as a motion to reconsider the denial of his mandamus petition, together with his actual motion for reconsideration.

A party seeking rehearing or reconsideration must specifically allege any point of law or fact that this Court overlooked or misapprehended. *See* Fed.R.App.P. 40. Jerdine has failed to do so. In his motions, Jerdine merely reiterates his arguments that he presented in his mandamus petition, but he fails to allege any point of law or fact that we overlooked or misapprehended. Accordingly, Jerdine's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

APPENDIX B

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-11534-G
Dist. Ct. Docket No. 05-cr-20251-all

[Filed June 8, 2006]

IN RE:)
)
ANTHONY L. JERDINE,)
Petitioner.)
)

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida

BEFORE: ANDERSON and BIRCH, Circuit Judges.

ORDER

Anthony L. Jerdine, a *pro se* federal prisoner, files this petition for writ of mandamus, requesting that this Court direct the district court to (1) show cause why the criminal proceedings against him should not be "abated," or (2) require the government to establish the district court's jurisdiction over him.

Mandamus is available "only in drastic situations, when no other adequate means are available to remedy a clear usurpation of power or abuse of discretion." *Jackson v. Motel 6 Multipurpose, Inc.*, 130 F.3d 999, 1004 (11th Cir. 1997). Mandamus may not be used as a substitute for appeal, or to control decisions of the district court in discretionary matters. Id. The petitioner has the burden of showing that the claimed right to issuance of the writ is clear and indisputable. In re Lopez-Lukis, 113 F.3d 1187, 1188 (11th Cir. 1997)

We find that Jerdine has an adequate alternative remedy because he could have appealed his conviction and sentence. *See United States v. Bobo*, 344 F.3d 1076, 1083 (11th Cir. 2003) (considering a defendant's argument on appeal that his indictment was defective). Accordingly, the mandamus petition is **Denied**. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i).

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
Miami Division

Case Number:06-20063-CIV-MARTINEZ

[Filed July 21, 2006]

ANTHONY LEWIS JERDINE, Petitioner,

vs.

T.R. SNIEZEK, WARDEN, Respondent.

ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

THE MATTER was referred to the Honorable Patrick A. White, United States Magistrate Judge for a Report and Recommendation on Petitioner's writ of habeas corpus **(D.E. No. 1)**, construed as a petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation **(D.E. No. 41)** on June 9, 2006 recommending that this case be dismissed as lacking any cognizable section 2241 claims. Petitioner has made a number of filings after the Report and Recommendation issued; however, none of these filings are objections to the Report

and Recommendation and none of these filings state any cognizable claims.[1] The Court has reviewed the entire file and record and will adopt and affirm Magistrate Judge White's well-reasoned report. Therefore, it is hereby:

ADJUDGED that United States Magistrate Judge White's Report and Recommendation **(D.E. No. 41)** is **AFFIRMED** and **ADOPTED**. Accordingly, it is

ADJUDGED that

1. The petition is dismissed for failure to state a cognizable claim.

2. Petitioner's motion to stay **(D.E. No. 30)** is **DENIED**.

3. Petitioner's Revised Motion for Clarification of Proceedings and Release of Docket Sheet **(D.E. No. 37)** is **DENIED**.

4. Petitioner's motion for clarification of proceedings and release of docket sheet **(D.E. No. 46)** is **DENIED**.

5. Petitioner's Motion to Vacate Void Judgment **(D.E. No. 47)** is **DENIED**.

6. Petitioner's Petitions for Writ of Mandamus **(D.E. Nos. 64, 66, & 67)** are **DENIED**.

---

[1] The Court has reviewed all of the filings made by Petitioner and finds that even under the liberal standard applied to pro se filings it is completely unclear what Petitioner is arguing.

7. Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment **(D.E. No. 69)** is **DENIED**.

8. Petitioner's Motion for Declaratory Judgment **(D.E. No. 70)** is **DENIED**.

9. Petitioner's Motion for Release of All Bonds **(D.E. No. 71)** is **DENIED**.

10. Petitioner's Motion for Disclosure of All Criminal Bonds, Bonding or Otherwise as Requested Below **(D.E. No. 72)** is **DENIED**.

11. Petitioner's Petition for redress in the nature of Quo Warranto **(D.E. No. 73)** is **DENIED**.

12. This Case is **CLOSED** and all other pending motions not otherwise ruled upon are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at Miami, Florida, this 21 day of July, 2006.

/s/ Jose E. Martinez
JOSE E. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
MIAMI DIVISION

Case Number: 05-20251-CR-GOLD
USM Number: 64257-004

[Filed December 20, 2005]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
v.)
)
ANTHONY L. JERDINE)
)

JUDGMENT IN A CRIMINAL CASE

The defendant pleaded guilty to Count(s) 1 of the Information.

The defendant is adjudicated guilty of the following offense(s):

TITLE/ SECTION NUMBER	NATURE OF OFFENSE	OFFENSE	COUNT
18 U.S.C. §371	Conspiracy to commit offenses against the	03/26/00	1

United States, that is, to transport and transfer stolen property in interstate commerce and to hamper and impede the lawful functions of the U.S. Food & Drug Adm. and the IRS.

The defendant is sentenced as provided in the following pages of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984.

It is ordered that the defendant must notify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of name, residence, or mailing address until all fines, restitution, costs and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid. If ordered to pay restitution, the defendant must notify the court and United States attorney of any material changes in economic circumstances.

Date of Imposition of Sentence: 12/15/2005

/s/ Alan S. Gold
ALAN S. GOLD
United States District Judge

December 20, 2005

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of **twenty-two (22) months**.

The defendant is remanded to the custody of the Untied States Marshal.

SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be on supervised release for a term of **3 years**.

The defendant shall report to the probation office in the district to which the defendant is released within 72 hours of release from custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

The defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime.

The defendant shall not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. The defendant shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. The defendant shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, as determined by the court.

The defendant shall not possess a firearm, destructive device, or any other dangerous weapon.

If this judgment imposes a fine or a restitution obligation, it is a condition of supervised release that the defendant pay in accordance with the Schedule of Payments sheet of this judgment.

The defendant must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court as well as any additional conditions on the attached page.

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

1. The defendant shall not leave the judicial district without the permission of the court or probation officer;

2. The defendant shall report to the probation officer as directed by the court or probation officer and shall submit a truthful and complete written report within the first five days of each month;

3. The defendant shall answer truthfully all inquiries by the probation officer and follow the instructions of the probation officer;

4. The defendant shall support his or her dependents and meet other family responsibilities;

5. The defendant shall work regularly at a lawful occupation unless excused by the probation officer for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons;

6. The defendant shall notify the probation officer **at least ten (10) days** prior to any change in residence or employment;

7. The defendant shall refrain from the excessive use of alcohol and shall not purchase, possess, use, distribute, or administer any controlled substance or any paraphernalia related to any controlled substances, except as prescribed by a physician;

8. The defendant shall not frequent places where controlled substances are illegally sold, used, distributed, or administered;

9. The defendant shall not associate with any persons engaged in criminal activity, and shall not associate with any person convicted of a felony unless granted permission to do so by the probation officer;

10. The defendant shall permit a probation officer to visit him or her at any time at home or elsewhere and shall permit confiscation of any contraband observed in plain view by the probation officer;

11. The defendant shall notify the probation officer within **seventy-two (72) hours** of being arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer;

12. The defendant shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or a special agent of a law enforcement agency without the permission of the court;

13. As directed by the probation officer, the defendant shall notify third parties of risks that may be occasioned by the defendant's criminal record or personal history or characteristics, and shall permit the probation officer to make such notifications and to confirm the defendant's compliance with such notification requirement.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

The defendant shall also comply with the following additional conditions of supervised release:

The defendant shall provide complete access to financial information, including disclosure of all business and personal finances, to the U.S. Probation Officer.

The defendant shall cooperate fully with the Internal Revenue Service in determining and paying any tax liabilities. The defendant shall provide to the Internal Revenue Service all requested documents and information for purposes of any civil audits, examinations, collections, or other proceedings. It is further ordered that the defendant file accurate income tax returns and pay all taxes, interest, and penalties due and owing by him/her to the Internal Revenue Service.

The defendant shall maintain full-time, legitimate employment and is not to be unemployed for a term of more than 30 days unless excused by the U.S. Probation Officer. Further, the defendant shall provide documentation including, but not limited to, pay stubs, contractual agreements, W-2 Wage and Earnings Statements, and other documentation requested by the U.S. Probation Officer.

The defendant shall obtain prior approval from the U.S. Probation Officer before entering into any self-employment.

The defendant shall submit to a search of his person or property conducted in a reasonable manner and at a reasonable time by the U.S. Probation Officer.

CRIMINAL MONETARY PENALTIES

The defendant must pay the total criminal monetary penalties under the Schedule of Payments.

Total Assessment	Total Fine	Total Restitution
$100.00	$10,000.00	$

*Findings for the total amount of losses are required under Chapters 109A, 110, 110A, and 113A of Title 18, United

States Code, for offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994, but before April 23, 1996.

SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Having assessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalties are due as follows:

A. Lump sum payment of $10,100.00 due immediately (see itemization on page 5 of this judgment).

Unless the court has expressly ordered otherwise, if this judgment imposes imprisonment, payment of criminal monetary penalties is due during imprisonment. All criminal monetary penalties, except those payments made through the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Financial Responsibility Program, are made to the clerk of the court.

The defendant shall receive credit for all payments previously made toward any criminal monetary penalties imposed.

The assessment/fine/restitution is payable to the U.S. COURTS and is to be addressed to:

U.S. CLERK'S OFFICE
ATTN: FINANCIAL SECTION
301 N. MIAMI AVENUE, ROOM 150
MIAMI, FLORIDA 33128

The assessment/fine/restitution is payable immediately. The U.S. Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Probation Office and the U.S. Attorney's Office are responsible for the enforcement of this order.

As part of the plea agreement the defendant shall forfeit the defendant's interest in the following property to the United States: **the sum of $771,398.76 in United States currency, which constitutes property subject to forfeiture under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 982(a)(1).**

The defendant's right, title and interest to the property identified in the preliminary order of forfeiture, which has been entered by the Court and is incorporated by reference herein, is hereby forfeited.

Payments shall be applied in the following order: (1) assessment, (2) restitution principal, (3) restitution interest, (4) fine principal (5) community restitution, (6) fine interest (7) penalties, and (8) costs, including cost of prosecution and court costs.

APPENDIX E

The Supreme Court of the United States
District of Columbia

SPECIAL VISITATION; Establishing Sua Sponte Original Jurisdiction of this Court over the below names Document; under the venue and Jurisdiction of the American Flag of Peace

Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine	)
A natural free-born American	)
Inhabitant, Sui Juris, De Soli	)
Jure Divino synonymous with	)
"the people"	)
	)
vs.	)
	)
The Bench members, Judges of the	)
court of **QUO WARRANTO RECORD**,	)
for United States District Court southern	)
district of Florida Cause	)
Number: 05-20251-CR-Gold Republic	)
in the Miami-Dade county, located in the	)
city of Miami.	)
	)
Defendant/Respondents	)
	)

PETITION FOR REDRESS IN THE NATURE OF QUO WARRANTO [28 U.S.C. § 1651]
QUO WARRANTO TO THE BENCH

To any and all Bench members/Judges of courts of record in the United States District Court - southern district of Florida from the Circuit Court of the United States of America, Eleventh Circuit.

The United States District Court - southern district of Florida and place on record.

Ohio Republic)
united States of America) ss: Common Law
Columbiana county)

Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine, hereafter "Demandant", without the Legislative venue and jurisdiction of the United States, UNITED STATES, STATE OF FLORIDA, and any STATE(S) of, sojourning within the Country of Florida and its Republic Form of Government, being first sworn accordingly in Law, having first hand knowledge of the acts herein below, being of the age of contract and competent to witness, declare and affirm the following as true, correct, certain, complete, and not misleading, to the best of Demandant's personal knowledge and belief, and to the penalty of perjury as articulated to in the Laws of the United States of American [Title 28 U.S.C. § 1746].

This **Petition for Redress in the nature of a QUO WARRANTO** is a Common-Law Constitutional Entity and operates in accordance with the following:

On December 6th, 1865, the Supreme Court of the United States of America conceded the ratification of the 13th Original Article in the Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Proposed in the year 1810, (2 U.S. Statutes at Large 613), it was recently discovered to have been properly ratified under the United States Constitution, Article V. The necessary number to achieve ratification was obtained when Virginia ratified the Article and promulgates its ratification in the Laws of many States as part of the Constitution.

The issue has been brought before the Supreme Court, and the Court conceded the ratification in a 6-3 vote. It was in effect from the day of ratification on March 12th, 1819, not from the time when the Supreme Court recognized it.

The ruling was promulgated in (cite omitted). The 13th Original Article in Amendment to the United States Constitution reads as follows and declares without equivocation:

> "If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility, or honor, or without the consent of congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatsoever, from any Emperor, King, Prince, or Foreign Power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them or either of them."

Integrated States Bars are a relatively recent innovation in the United States. They were promulgated through the American BAR Association (hereinafter "IBA"). The International Bar Association's mailing address is: Byron House, 7/9 St. James Street, London SW1A1EE, England, historically known as the **"THE FOUNTAIN OF HONOR."**

An "Honor" is an advantage or special privilege...A license granted to some, but not generally possessed by others, giving some unequal opportunity to achieve or exercise political power.

Only BAR members have the PRIVILEGE to "PRACTICE LAW".

In addition to that, BAR Members have the "HONOR" to exclusive opportunity to become Judges of the Courts of record within United States District Court "No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States", United States Constitution Article 1, cl. 17.

This "Honor" is void through the "Supremacy Clause", *Maryland v. Louisiana*, 451 U.S. 725, 746 (1981), 101 S. Ct. 2114, 2128, 2129, U.S. Supreme Court, "All Laws which are repugnant to the constitution are null and void", *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, (1803).

Having accepted a "Title of Honor" under law, the Judge(s) presiding in the Courts of Record in the United States District Court - southern district of Florida, are each **"incapable of holding any office of trust or profit"** from the time when they accepted the **"Honor"** Membership to the BAR.

Their citizenship is void; they are foreign powers whose lawful status is that of aliens, (Title 8 U.S.C. § 1101 (a)). They possess no immunities for any purpose, nor protection from any source, and any alleged Judgment(s) or Order(s) from these foreign powers have no standing in Law, they are void from the beginning and confer no power to enforce.

FURTHER SAYETH DEMANDANT NOT

Notice: You are hereby **Commanded** by **Writ of Right, Quo Warranto**, to provide the following information in **CERTIFIED COPY** form, for the record and to the Demandant:

1. By what authority the Judge(s) of Courts of record for he U. S. District Court - southern district of Florida, purport to hold Demandant in restraint, deprived of Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness, and:

2. By what authority the Judge(s) of the Court of record for the U.S. District Court - southern district of Florida, exercise any alleged power of authority, and:

3. By what legal process of Law, the Judge(s) of Courts of record for the U.S. District Court - southern district of Florida, located at the city of Miami, exercise any alleged power of authority, and:

4. Where is the location of, and who is the keeper, or record in which the Judge(s) of Courts of record for the U. S. District Court - southern district of Florida, located at the judicial Branch of Government by Electors in compliance to the "Separation of Powers" Doctrine, and:

5. When the Judge(s) of Courts of record for the U. S. District Court - southern district of Florida, current membership to the State Bar Association became active and each BAR Number, and:

6. Each Judge(s) of Courts of record for The U. S. District Court - southern district of Florida, "Oath of Office", "Bond Certificate", total amount of Bonded Funds and

Mailing location where the Bonded Funds are currently being held.

Subscribed and affirmed by the voluntary act of My own hand, in the county of Columbiana within Ohio republic on this 19th day of the June, month, in the year of our Lord, 2006.

/s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
A natural free-born American Inhabitant
Sui Juris, De Jure Soli, Jure Divino

APPENDIX F

Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
c/o 28220 Red Raven Road
Pepper Pike, Ohio 44124

Date: July 4, 2006

Affidavit of Expatriation

OHIO)
CUYAHOGA COUNTY)

Having been duly sworn, Affiant Declares the Following:

1. I Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine, herein after "Affiant", "Declarant", am competent to state to the matters included in this statement, have knowledge of the facts, and declare that the statements made herein, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, and not meant to mislead.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Affiant here affirms he was BORN a de jure Sovereign Citizen on the land which is beyond the sea, on Ohio, June 10, 1971 under a constitution created under the common law through the sovereign electors on Ohio, one of the several states of the union of states that is the constitutional republic, United States of America, to which entities Affiant has owed and does owe and has given his permanent allegiance. [[And am now, one of the de jure [Sovereign] state Citizens Domiciled on the land, on Ohio.]] and here affirms he has not knowingly or willingly entered into any agreement or taken any action with purpose of intent to alter this.

Pursuant to Title 8 U.S.C. § 1481(a) (2), Defendant has and does hereby reserve all rights under common law and this code in termination of all portions of any implied or adhesive trust of Unrevealed Contracts not entered into knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally by Defendant under full disclosure, including the compelled benefit imposed upon me of limited liability to discharge my debts using federal reserve notes, being the only medium of exchange of practical use in commerce; or any such adhesive trusts or Unrevealed Contracts that without Affiant's knowledge or consent may attempt to bind him to any position with and of a 14th Amendment citizen of the United States, federal or "US Citizen", or "U.S. person" of the federal United States, or of the federal UNITED STATES, INC. or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO, OR, to any vessel of legal fiction of a derivative of my Christian name created by the federal United States, the federal UNITED STATES, INC., or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO.

Affiant affirms he is a Sovereign Citizen on the land, on Ohio and on which he is domiciled and has legal address: on the land near 28220 Red Raven Rd., Pepper Pike, Cuyahoga County, Ohio of which land Affiant avers no knowledge the Secretary of State of Ohio has ever declared to have been ceded to the federal United States, the federal Corporation UNITED STATES, or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO.

Further, Affiant here avers and affirms by any past self-identification or indication on any government forms, applications or documents of whatever jurisdiction as himself being a "Citizen of the United states" or a "United States citizen", he has thereby intended to communicate or acknowledge solely that he is a Citizen as defined in the Preamble," [*Van Valkenburg v. Brown*, 43 Cal. Sup. Ct. 43

(1872)], **a citizen of the Constitutional republic, United States of America by virtue of being a sovereign born dejure, state Citizen of Ohio, domiciled on the land, on Ohio, a state of the republic, of the union of several states that is the Constitutional republic, united States of America,** as determined in [*Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 19 How. 393, 404 (1856)]" **the phrase "Citizen of the United States" as found in the original Constitution is synonymous with the phrase "Citizen of one of the United States* *,** And in *Gardina v. Board of Registrars*, 160 Ala. 155, 48 S. 788, 791 (1909); *State v. Fowler*, 41 La. Ann. 380, 6 S. 601 (1889); *Crosse v. Board of Supervisors of Elections*, 243 Md. 555, 221 A.2d 431, (1966). **"One can be a state Citizen without also being a federal citizen."**

And further **"there is a citizenship of the United States** and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other** and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual." [*Slaughter House Cases*, 83 U.S. 36] [(1873) emphasis added] *(U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542] (**1875 "Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of its own."**

In ***Powe v. U.S.* 109 F2d 147, 149 (1940)** the court determined the term "citizen" when used in federal laws, **excludes State citizens**. *U.S. v. Perkins*, 16 S Ct. 1073, 163 U.S. 625, **The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state. Title 28, U.S.C. 297** defines the several States of the union as being **"countries"** in subsection (b) **and the individual states foreign to the United States.)**

And as further confirmed in *Texas v. White,* 7 Wallace 700 (1869):

"The original Constitution of 1787 is perpetual, as is the Citizenship that is recognized by it."

[[and Affiant has further revoked, corrected or amended all known government forms, applications or documents of whatever jurisdiction that by use of the terms "citizen of the United States", federal or "US Citizen", or "U.S. person" may have wrongly and erroneously been construed to identify the Defendant as a citizen of the federal United States, of the federal UNITED STATES, INC., or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO or as subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or as anything other than a Citizen on the state of the republic wherein he is domicile: a state of the union of the several states that is that constitutional republic, the United States of America]].

Pursuant to
U.S. Code: Title 8 : Section 1481

Section 1481. Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen; voluntary action; burden of proof; presumptions

(a) A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality by voluntarily performing any of the following acts with the intention of relinquishing United States nationality

(b) Taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, after having attained the age of eighteen years;

Pursuant to 15 United states Statute at Large, 223-224 (1868) CHAP, CCLIX - An Act concerning the Rights of American Citizens in foreign States, which states:

> Whereas the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of al people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and whereas in the recognition of this principle, this government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship;...and whereas it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of foreign allegiance should be promptly and finally disavowed; Therefore,
>
> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representative of the United States of America in Congress assembled, **That any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officers of this government which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government ....**

Approved, July 27, 1868

And pursuant to *Savorgnan v. United States*, 1950, 338 U.S. 491,498 note 11, 70 S. Ct. 292, 296, 94 L. Ed. 287 which states referring to said act:

[1]Although designed to apply especially to the rights of immigrants to shed their foreign nationalities, that Act of Congress "is also broad enough to cover, and does cover, the corresponding natural and inherent right of American citizens to expatriate themselves."

Further pursuant to ***Walter Briehl v. John Foster Dulles***, 284 F2d 561, 583 (1957) which affirms;

The Supreme Court has held that the Citizenship Act of 1907 and the Nationality Act of 1940" are to be read **in the light of the declaration of policy favoring freedom of expatriation which stands unrepealed."** Ld., 338 U.S. at pages 498-499, 70 S. Ct. at page 296, 22 U.S.C.A. § 211a and 8 U.S.C.A. § 1185."

Therefore, by his own will and act Affiant does here further renounce and expatriate himself from federally enfranchised citizenship as a subject of Congress under its possession or protections of the 14th amendment as a "citizen of the United States", federal or "US or United States Citizen", or "U.S. person" of the federal United States, or of the federal UNITED STATES, INC. or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO and from his loyalty or fidelity or allegiance to the same and does here, purge and renounce any remaining presumption of such.

And, I Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine make this expatriation Declaration in intention to sever forever the legal relations of citizenship or nationality between the Declarant herein and the federal United states, the federal UNITED STATES, INC. and its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO; and any position with and of a 14th Amendment "citizen of the United States", federal or "~~US Citizen~~", or "U.S. person" of the federal United States, or of the federal UNITED STATES, INC. or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO.

And Declarant here solemnly declares and reaffirms his sovereign born dejure, state Citizenship further arising from, and as declared herein, his **Domicile on the land, on Ohio,**

a state of the republic and further here solemnly declares and reaffirms his fidelity, loyalty and allegiance thereto and obedience to the laws thereof, and of all rights incident thereto, and thereby his citizenship in the union of the 50 states of that constitutional republic, the United States of America;

[1]9 Pet. 692, 34 U.S. 692, 699, 9 L.Ed. 276.

Affiant here avers and affirms That this Declaration will serve as a bar, nunc pro tunc, in any legal relations insofar as citizenship of the federal United States, the Federal UNITED STATES, INC., or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO is concerned;

That this Declaration will serve as Declarant's status in regard to any contact, tie or relationship to he federal United States, the federal UNITED STATES, INC., or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO.

Affiant affirms he is **a sovereign born man on the land, on Ohio**, a state of the Constitutional republic, which Affiant here affirms as historical and academic fact of statutory law and Supreme Court ruling is a foreign jurisdiction to the federal United States, or the corporate federal United States, which is a **foreign corporation** and jurisdiction with respect to a **state of the republic and its Citizens.**

(Again, As noted above, *U.S.v. Cruiksank,* 92 U.S. 542] [(1875 **"Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of its own."**

In ***Powe v. U.S.* 109 F2d 147, 149 (1940)** the court determined the term **'citizen'** when used in federal laws, **excludes State citizens.** ***U.S.v. Perkins***, 16 S.Ct. 1073, 163

U.S. 625, **The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state. Title 28, U.S.C. 297** defines the several States of the union as being "countries" in subsection(b) **and the individual states foreign to the United States.)**

And Affiant further here affirms as historical and academic fact, regarding the federal United States, the federal UNITED STATES, INC., or its federal areas or jurisdiction STATE OF OHIO, I am by definition, and **under 28 U.S.C. 1332 and 1603 a citizen of a foreign state**, non-resident to the federal United States, or the federal corporation UNITED STATES, therefore **without or outside** the federal United States, the federal corporation UNITED STATES or its federal area or jurisdiction, STATE OF OHIO.

And by definition of law herein referenced, Affiant here affirms as historical and academic fact I am not an enemy combatant to the UNITED STATES under 40 Stat. 411 commonly known as the Trading with the Enemy Act, via the Amendatory Act of March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1. Affiant has not engaged in rebellion against the lawful order of America, has not waged war against the UNITED STATES, and has no affiliations with known dissidents or advocates of the overthrow of the UNITED STATES, and Affiant claims all rights relief, securities and protections guaranteed him under the **Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. 1602-1611, and 90 STAT 2891;** and under 18 U.S.C. 112. **Protection of internationally protected persons.**

Affiant here avers and affirms

That this act and Declaration will set the conditions precedent under the rules of special pleading by special appearance in all

cases in controversy insofar as the status of Declarant's Citizenship is concerned;

That the picture affixed as Exhibit "A" to this Declaration is the true and correct image of the Declarant herein.

That this declaration is made under and pursuant to International Law and the Law of Nations, without prejudice.

Further Affiant sayeth not.

/s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine 7/4/06
Affiant
Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine, Sui Juris
De Jore Soli, Jure Divino

APPENDIX G

ASSEVERATION AND DECLARATION OF STATUS

The State of Ohio)
) ss
The Columbiana county)

Affiant, Anthony-Lewis without the Legislative venue and jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES, and of STATE OF OHIO, and or any alleged Federal Territory, and or any alleged commercial, admirality, maritime, and or some other venue/jurisdiction foreign to Affiant's nature, being first duly sworn accordingly in Law, having firsthand knowledge of the facts contained herein below, being of age to contract, and competent to witness, do Lawfully Declare and Affirm that the following facts are true, correct, complete, certain, and not misleading to the best of Affiant's personal knowledge and belief, and given to the penalty of perjury as articulated to by the Creator, and enumerated in the laws of the united States of America [Title 28 U.S.C., § 1746 (1)].

Affiant, hereinafter "I, Me, My" am a Natural Born Free, Sui Juris, Inhabitant, an American by birth, of earthly Father's and Mother's appellation; earthly Father and Mother also being naturally Born Free Americans of the several sovereign state Republics of the Grand American Union: known as the united States of America respectively, both of the same Divine decent and Free Americans as were progentity, as also My offspring and their progeny. I am so sojourning in Ohio republic, of a transient nature to the

UNITED STATES, STATE OF OHIO, and or any "STATE OF' created and endowed by our Creator: the one supreme Being, with alienable Rights as articulated in the Constitutions of the United States for the united States of America and The States of Ohio for Ohio republic, and affirmed in the Declaration of Independence. My jurisdiction is My Sovereign Domain and My Flag is the American Flag of Peace.

I have never knowingly, willfully, intentionally, or voluntarily waived any of these unalienable rights. I freely choose to obey all Constitutional American Law and Pay all Lawful taxes in jurisdictions applicable to Me for the common good. I stand My self, with Assistance, Special Sui Juris with Judicial Power, and non-assumpsit to any de facto STATE, State, or state. I am not a member of any body corporate or politic. My Status of American (Citizen) [Article 2:1:5, 1:2:3, 4:2:1, and 3:2:1 U.S. Const.],and My Unalienable Rights are NO T negotiable.

I a creation only of the One Supreme Being: Creator, a Free agent, being a subject, slave or peon to none, have never, knowingly, willfully, intentionally, or voluntarily given My power of attorney, appointment, or sovereign Status to any other party, be it some form of government, person, or organization, or any other entity. Any and all Acts, instruments, paper matter, possessions, some form of and or My personal private property such as: "photographs", "fingerprints", "handwritings" "voiceprints" "blood samples", "urine samples" and "exemplars" of any kind bearing the aforementioned or shrewd entrapments that may have been alleged against Me or, I unwittingly endorsed or entered into by deception, shrewd entrapments or fraud, I HEREBY, Revoke, Release, Cancel, Denounce Nunc Pro Tunc, including, but, not all inclusive, all registrations, licenses, certificates, appointments, and any implied contracts

or adhesions allegedly entered into by any provision of "color [counterfeit] of law," without specific Notice of Intent, government, or shrewd entrapment of commercial enterprise in the past, present, or future and consider all such signatures or adhesions NULL and VOID. This is in law, LAWFUL NOTICE, that all the aforementioned personal property, and any of my signatures of the past, present and future, with any such form of government, government banks or otherwise adhesion sources are to be under "Threat, Duress, and Coercion," hereinafter "TDC" and non-assumpsit, whether appearing, therewith or otherwise. Nor will I be compelled to perform under any contract or agreement of any nature that I have not entered into knowingly, intentionally, and voluntarily, and that I do not, nor have I ever accepted liability associated with the compelled benefit of any veiled commercial agreement or any veiled nexus of relationship therein. I claim all property rights, including the right to use of dedicated properties and lands.

Recent studies have revealed to the people and My self, that U.S. Governments have, by shrewd legal entrapment, deception, color of law and Constructive Fraud, deceived Americans into thinking they have or are waiving rights and privileges given to all Americans by the Creator and affirmed by the organic documents known as the Constitutions, and placing Americans under de facto and foreign JURISDICTION/AUTHORITY, in order to place Americans in a presumed voluntary position, being an inferior state and involuntary peonage and enslavement.

With this knowledge, the people and I believe that I am NOT SUBJECT to the territorial--limited "Exclusive Legislation" and its foreign jurisdiction mandated for Washington District of Columbia (Art. 1:8:17-18 U.S. Const.] including its foreign "internal" government

organizations therein or by contract adhesion [nexus] thereto intertwined throughout our land, including any 'STATE(S) OF', I therefore lawfully "squarely challenge" the fraudulent JURISDICTION/AUTHORITY, that does not apply to Me, *Main v. Thiboutot* [100 S.Ct 2502 (1980)], *Hagan v. Lavine* [45 U.S. 528, 533], and that Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time, "*Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co.* [495 F.2d906, 910], and "Where there is absence of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceeding are a nullity and confer no right, offer no justification," *Thompson v. Tolme* [7 L.Ed. 381 (1829)], *Girffeth v. Frazier* [3 L.Ed. 471, 12 U.S. 9 (1814)], Title 5 U.S.C., § 558(b), and with "the supreme Law of the Land," upholding the Sovereign American [Citizen], in that "All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are NULL and VOID," *Marbury v. Madison* [5 U.S. 137 (1803)]. It is therefore incumbent upon any form of government, and or any of its jurisdiction over the people and My self [Title 5 U.S.C., § 556(d)]. Persons violating jurisdiction shall be charged under 'YOUR' Title Eighteen United States Criminal Code [Title 18 U.S.C., §§ 242, 241, 872, 1001, 1621, 1622, 2381, 2383, 2384, 2385, 2386], and all applicable Law, for their high understanding and superior knowledge of the law and perjury of oaths.

It appears in law, that I, by My status of Sovereign American Citizenship, am a foreign as a Non-Resident Alien to the [U.S. Const. Art. 1:8:17-18] District of Columbia's Federal Government and or any 'STATE(S) OF', as likewise to Russia.

I hereby give **LAWFUL NOTICE and DECLARE**: I have never resided in the 'District of Columbia" and or any "STATE(S) OF', that I am NOT a "subject", "citizen", "resident", "voter", "taxpayer", "servant", "slave", "person" [artificial person], nor "chattel", or "property" to

any form of government, nor equal under the [color] law with corporations or politicians, insidiously created by some Form of Government to confuse, deceive, dominate, and usurp the Sovereign American People, as created by the 13th and14th Articles in the Amendment to the National Constitution.

That I am Sovereign, as the people, over the instruments of our creation, namely our limited form of governments, created for the protection of natural rights and liberties, and our organic and Supreme Law, and respect only My Creator as Sovereign to Me in Whom the people trust. The form of governments, having incorporated, have laid down their Sovereignty to become persons, under the Clearfield Doctrine and therefore exercise power by tyrannical military police power [martial law rule], using unauthorized War Powers and perpetrating mixed war with color of authority, in total defiance of the people's unalienable, Creator-endowed rights.

That I have read, studied and understand the Constitution of the United States for The united States of America and the Constitution of The State of Ohio for Ohio republic, and that all alleged governments and their agents, employees, assigns, successors, and their principal actors have taken an oath to protect and defend the above Organic documents from all enemies, both foreign and domestic, prior to taking office and or serving the people of the several sovereign state Republics of the Grand American Union.

That as a member of the Sovereign Republic so sojourning in the country of Ohio, I am an Elector therein and a member with the responsibility and duty in defense of Self, Family, De Jure state, fellow Americans [Oath of Allegiance, U.S. Const. Amend. Art. 2, 9, 10], and hold my solemn responsibilities equal to My liberties I have never taken an oath of attorney or of public office.

My rights, having been endowed by the Creator of all things in heaven and earth (universe), and declared as unalienable, can NOT be alienated from Me, by My self or any form of government without serious consequences. All who would transgress, usurp, dominate, and violate these rights will be held accountable before The One Supreme Being and Creator of the Universe and Judge of all, by which judgment is reserved to him.

This is in law, **LAWFUL PUBLIC NOTICE** of My status, Nunc Pro Tunc.

NOTICE: If within **Thirty** (30) **Days** filing of this document out of necessity, as a public record, The State of Ohio and any concerned or interested parties having NOT provided verifiable lawful evidence to the contrary of these declarations, on a point-by-point basis, under the penalty of perjury, having firsthand knowledge, as cited; the foregoing facts and TRUTHS declared SHALL stand as prima facie and ultimate, being undisputed, and **Failure to respond** by silent acquiescence SHALL BE DEEMED The State of Ohio and all concerned or interested parties of the world **Expressed Affirmation(s)** to all that is declared with this document are true, as affirmed, and that I enjoy complete, absolute diplomatic immunity under My Flag of Peace during My special visitation, and I travel through a perpetual neutral zone.

NOTICE: That "Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal" applies to this public notice. **Notice:** That the "Law of Principal and Agent" specifies that, "The Agent is PERSONALLY liable for acts not authorized by the Principal."

NOTICE: Any process of recording this document **SHALL NOT** alter or change the Sovereign American Status of this document, nor hinder its eternal perpetuity.

FURTHER SAYETH I NAUGHT

Subscribed and affirmed by the voluntary act of My own hand, in the county of Columbiana, within Ohio republic on this 4th day of the seventh month, in the year of our Lord, 2006.

Sincerely,

/s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
Anthony-Lewis
A natural free born American Inhabitant,
Sui Juris: De Jure Soli, Jure Divino

OATH OF A FREEMAN

I Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family, being (by God's providence) an Inhabitant, and Freeman, within the jurisdiction of this Republic, do freely acknowledge myself to be contingent as representative to the government thereof, and therefore do hereby give my oath of honor, let my yeas be yeas and my nays be nays, by the great and dreadful name of the Ever-Living God, that I will be true and faithful to the same, and will accordingly yield assistance and support thereunto, with my flesh and blood body and estate, as in equity I am bound; and will also truly endeavor to maintain and preserve all the liberties and privileges thereof, to yield by consenting/contracting myself to the wholesome laws and orders made and established by the same, and further, that I will not plot, or practice any evil against it, nor consent to any that shall do so, but will timely discover, and reveal the same, to lawful authority now here established, for he speedy preventing thereof. Moreover I do solemnly bind myself, in the light of God, that when I shall be called, to give my voice touching any such matter of this state, (in which freeman are to deal), I will stand in as Elector and suffrage, as I shall judge in my own conscience, whether ministerial or judicially, may best conduce and tend to the public weal of the body, without respect to persons, or favor of any Man. So help me God in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ

NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL

NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT

APPLICABLE TO ALL SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS

APPENDIX H

In the Supreme Court of the United States
District of Columbia

Anthony-Lewis	)
Demandant,	)
	)
-vs-	)
	)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
ANNE R. SCHULTZ-AUSA	)
Respondent(s).	)
	)

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

Emergency Petition

AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT

State of Ohio)
) ss
County of Columbia)

Affiant, Anthony-Lewis:Jerdine, **states that the facts contained herein below are true, correct, complete, and not misleading, to the best of affiant's personal knowledge and belief.**

1. On or about January 11, 2006 affiant filed, and served upon Clarence Maddox as Clerk of the District Court - Southern, District of Florida, Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus with attached Evidence in support, writ of Habeas Corpus and Notice of Hearing. Said Clerk, Clarence Maddox refused to access to the court of a Writ of Habeas Corpus, suspending Anthony-Lewis' right to Habeas Corpus. Affiant has not seen any tanks in the streets, aerial bombardments, nor any other evidence of invasion or rebellion upon which the great writ could be suspended, and Clarence Maddox - Clerk of Court failed to state any facts upon which Anthony-Lewis:Jerdine could rely in lawfully suspending the right to Habeas Corpus proceedings.

2. Whereas Anthony-Lewis:Jerdine has been denied access to the courts of the **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**, Anthony-Lewis has exhausted his remedies and is therefore entitled to relief in this court, unless this court can enter specific finding of fact and conclusion of law upon which the right to the remedy of Habeas Corpus my be lawfully suspended under those treaties, conventions, compacts, agreements, and constitutions to which the United States of America is a party.

3. Anthony-Lewis did not waive extradition, nor probable cause, or his due process rights.

4. **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**, acting under color of law, refuses to provide access to the court for the **WRITE OF HABEAS CORPUS** pleadings prepared by Anthony-Lewis, and further continues to refuse to identify the nature and cause of the seizure of Anthony-Lewis and the exact venue, exact jurisdiction, nor any specific nexus of

relationship for authority in law for the seizure of Anthony-Lewis.

5. **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** refused to identify whether the seizure is based on any specific, identifiable, commercial venue, geographical venue, contractual venue, nor to identify any specific evidence upon which **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** has determined that Anthony-Lewis was within a specific venue in which **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** has any authority to act.

6. **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**, and those acting in concert with **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** have refused to identify whether the seizure is civil, criminal, administrative, or of some other nature.

7. **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**, and those acting in concert with **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** have refused to identify whether the seizure is based upon common law or admiralty law if criminal, nor whether jurisdiction is claimed under maritime, ecclesiastical, common law, equity, or some other jurisdiction.

8. **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** has placed Anthony-Lewis in the custody of the **BUREAU OF PRISONS** who continues the seizure of Anthony-Lewis.

9. **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** has failed to provide any answers relating to the nature and cause of the **United States Marshal's** seizure, and has failed to prevent or correct the seizure for which s/he has provided no explanation of the nature and cause of the seizure of Anthony-Lewis.

10. The **U.S. Marshal's** having seized, and subsequently transported Anthony-Lewis to another location, **UNITED**

STATES OF AMERICA acting in concert, are currently holding Anthony-Lewis' demands for an explanation of the nature and cause of the seizure, and continue to deny Anthony-Lewis' demands to for access to a court of competent jurisdiction to determine the lawfulness of the seizure by either "Show Cause" or "Habeas Corpus" proceeding, which Anthony-Lewis has demanded on numerous occasions of **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** by and through the Courts and/or agents of **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**.

11. Affiant states that Anthony-Lewis has natural, due process, right granted by his creator, and as articulated in numerous historical documents including, but not limited to, the original constitution for the united States of America, Magna carta, and numerous international treaty(s), to be informed of the nature and cause of the seizure of Anthony-Lewis and to have immediate judicial review to determine whether or not said seizure is lawful contrary to law, and in breach of numerous Conventions, Treaties, and Agreements to which the **United States District Court - Southern District of Florida** corporation **UNITED STATES,** and its franchise political corporations **STATE OF FLORIDA**, are parties.

12. Anthony-Lewis is unable to access any remedy in the normal course of law when the party(s) who seized and continue the seizure of Anthony-Lewis refuse to disclose the nature and cause of the seizure specifically refusing to identify the venue, jurisdiction, and nexus of authority in law upon which the seizure is based.

Affiant herein petitions the above entitled court, and demands of the judicial officer(s) thereof to perform the ministerial duty(s) to prevent, or correct, the wrongful seizure

identified herein, which said judicial officer(s) have executed a sworn contract, Oath of Office, incorporating the duty(s) articulated in 42 USC 1986, the performance of which is secured by said judicial officer(s) Official Bond or surety, to issue the attached **WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS** forthwith, **or within 24 hours**, whichever is sooner, commanding **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** to bring forth Anthony-Lewis and produce verified evidence of the nature and cause of the continuing seizure of Anthony-Lewis, and specifically identifying the venue, jurisdiction, and nexus of authority for relationship in law upon which Anthony-Lewis is seized.

Affirmed and subscribed this 27th day of August, 2006 A.D., under penalties of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States, and the State of Ohio.

Declaratory judgment sought:

Anthony-Lewis further petitions and demands to know the nature and cause of the suspensions of access to habeas Corpus rights in Florida and/or Ohio, and that such suspension is lawful thus not a willful and wanton disregard of Anthony-Lewis's rights by the judicial and executive officer(s) of **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**.

/s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
Affiant signature
for Anthony-Lewis
In Propria Persona, Sui Juris
De Jure Soli, Jure Divino

APPENDIX I

In the Supreme Court of the United States
District of Columbia

Anthony-Lewis	)
Demandant,	)
	)
-vs-	)
	)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
ANNE R. SCHULTZ-AUSA	)
Respondent(s).	)
	)

AFFIDAVIT AND NOTICE OF PERSONAL SERVICE OF PETITION FOR WRIT WITH EVIDENCE, WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND NOTICE OF HEARING

Emergency Petition

State of Ohio	)	
	)	ss.
County of Columbiana	)	

The undersigned, being first duly sworn, upon oath, deposes and says:

1. On the 11th day of January, 2006 A.D., and at the address of 301 N. Miami Avenue - Room 150 in the city of Miami, in Miami-Dade County, Florida, I served the Petition of habeas corpus with attached evidence, a writ of habeas

corpus with notice of hearing and the filing fee, in the above entitled action/writ, a copy of which is attached hereto, upon Clarence maddox clerk/deputy clerk of the United States District Court, by personally delivering a true and correct copy thereof and leaving same.

However, the privilege of the writ has been suspended, witnessed by one of the activities, stated below, evidencing said suspension.

(Please circle number(s) that apply)

(1) Judge did not sign order;
(2) Clerk did not sign writ;
(3) Clerk did not file;
(4) Return of service not made;
(5) Return of Writ not made.

NOTICE

You are hereby notified, by affidavit, and by way of the ancient writ of praecipe (writ of instruction to the clerk of the court) to take special notice of the ARTICLE I § 9 of the Constitution of the United States of America, and Article I § 13 of the Constitution of the State of Florida which provides to wit:

> "The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety requires it."
> "The writ of habeas corpus shall be grantable of right, freely and without cost. It shall be retrunable without delay, and shall never be suspended unless, in cases of rebellion, invasion, suspension is essential to the public safety."

You are further notified to take special notice that the Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus makes the clerk of the **UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT** knowledgeable of the wrongs mentioned in U.S.C. 42 § 1985 and unless it can be shown in writing by the clerk of the **UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT** that the conditions exist as prescribed by the constitution of the United States of America and the State of Florida, that is, due to a state of rebellion or invasion, the writ of habeas corpus has been suspended, it is the duty and obligation of the clerk of the **UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT** to **ISSUE AND DELIVER** the **ATTACHED WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS** without delay.

Signed: /s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine 8/27/06
In Propria Persona Sui Juris
A natural free-born American
De Jure Soli Jure Divino

APPENDIX J

In the Supreme Court of the United States
District of Columbia

Anthony-Lewis	)
Petitioner,	)
	)
-vs-	)
	)
UNITED STATES	)
ANNE R. SCHULTZ (AUSA)	)
Respondent(s).	)
	)

ORDER FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS-BY HIGHER COURT DIRECTIVE TO LOWER COURT [Title 28 U.S.C. § 1653]

Emergency Petition

On reading and filing the Petition of Anthony-Lewis, signed and verified by Petitioner, whereby it appears that Petitioner is illegally imprisoned and restrained of liberty by LOREN A GRAYER, Warden of FDC-Miami, and then committed and transferred to the Bureau of Prisons facility known as FCI Elkton, in the county of Columbiana, in the state of Ohio, under the command of T.R. SNIEZEK, Warden, and stating wherein the alleged illegality consists, from which it appears to this Court that a writ of habeas corpus should issue.

It is ordered:

1. The clerk shall file the Petition for writ of habeas corpus and attached evidence in the above entitled cause and issue a writ of habeas corpus as requested, out of and under seal of the United States District Court - Southern District of Florida, in the state of Florida, returnable in said court on _____ 2006 A.D., at _____ am/pm; and

2. Directed to such Warden, commanding the Warden to have the custody of Petitioner before said court, in UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT courtroom, on _____, 2006 A.D. at _____ a.m./p.m., of that day to do and receive what shall then and there be considered concerning Petitioner, together with the time, nature and cause of Petitioner's detention, and that Petitioner have then and there the writ; and

3. On the return of the writ, the judge of the United States District Court - Southern District of Florida, shall hear whatever evidence the parties adduce in connection, with the confinement of the Petitioner, and, within three (3) days from the date of such hearing, the judge shall certify a transcript of such evidence to this court.

_____	_____
Judicial Officer Signature	Date
_____	8/27/06
Judicial Officer Name	Date
Anthony L. Jerdine©	/s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
Name, for Anthony-Lewis	Signature

APPENDIX K

In the supreme Court of the United States
District of Columbia

Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family	)
Petitioner	)
	)
Vs	)
	)
United States of America aca: UNITED	)
STATES OF AMERICA A corporation(s)	)
sole acting through its beneficiary members...	)
	)

OBSERVATIONS AND DECLARATION OF PUBLIC MINISTER

VERIFICATION

Columbiana county	)	
	)	*VERIFIED DECLARATION*
The State of Ohio	)	

Declarant, Anthony-Lewis, states that he is competent to be a witness, that the facts contained herein are true, correct, complete, and not misleading to the best of Declarant's first hand knowledge and belief under penalty of perjury pursuant to the Law of The State of Ohio.

DEFINITIONS

1. Attached to Petitioner's initial pleading is a DEFINITION MEMORANDUM, which is incorporated by reference as if fully reproduced herein. Further for the purposes of this instrument only, the following terms shall have the meaning supplied as follows: "Plaintiff' means The "Inhabitant" Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family, as presented by The united States of America by and through its public minister(s); "Defendant" means all Respondents to above captioned action, and all principals, officer, employees, agents, and/or assigns thereof either directly, or through any agency or instrumentality thereof.

NOTICE OF INCORPORATION

Petitioner's pleadings and process to date are incorporated herein by this reference as if fully reproduced herein.

NOTICE OR REDERESS

2. Know all parties of these presents: the Plaintiff has granted the above captioned court limited jurisdiction to determine the status of the parties and jurisdiction in the matter of the Plaintiff's PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCE, jurisdiction to prevent or correct wrongs perpetrated by the courts' officer, Defendant and counsel, and to take other such action as is appropriate in law in the nature of [Title 42 USC § 1986, 18 USC § 4, and CJC 3].

3. NOTICE: The Plaintiff has reason to believe that the Defendant's counsel had intended the Defendant's action(s) filed under cause number 05-20251-CR-GOLD, United States District Court to relate to the Plaintiff, even

though the Plaintiff is not named thereon, due to the fact the defendant named in the Plaintiff's pleadings in that matter has a name resembling that of the Plaintiff, and Defendant United States of America has used the same fictitious name and address in its previous process upon which the above captioned action lies. However, it appears that the defendant's name may have been converted as a fiction at law.

4. The records provided by US District Court, admit that a R. Alexander Acosta, acting in the name of Defendant UNITED STATES and as a member of its agency Florida State Bar Association, Member, signed unsworn instruments creating a record initiating the actions removed hereby.

5. Defendants, including but not limited to UNITED STATES, have admitted that it/they have no standing to cause such an action to apply to Plaintiff.

6. Having admitted that the fictitious name does not relate to Plaintiff, Defendant United States of America continues to cause, or allow to be caused, Seizure and restraint of Plaintiff's property and liberty, under color of authority.

7. **NOTICE OF POSSIBLE CRIMINAL ACTIVITY**: Having admitted it has no standing to bring such action against Plaintiff under color of its private code(s), United States of America continues to restrain Plaintiff, against the fictitious name under which it attacks Plaintiff, evidencing an organized scheme or racket to harass, intimidate, and retaliate against the complaining witness in the above captioned action.

STATUS OF PLAINTIFF

8. Plaintiff is a natural born inhabitant on the land of The united States of America.

9. Plaintiff retains and asserts all inherent rights endowed to Plaintiff by the Plaintiff's creator.

10. Plaintiff's claim to liberty precedes by blood, birth, and descent, prior to the establishment of the original jurisdiction of The united States of America AD 1791 or the establishment of the municipal corporation of the District of Columbia a/k/a/ the United States 1871.

11. Plaintiff is not a party to the Constitution for The united States Of America as amended AD 1791, or the United States Constitution of the municipal corporation of the District of Columbia a/k/a the United States 1871.

12. Plaintiff is not subject of Great Britain.

13. Plaintiff is not a citizen of any State of the United States as defined in PL June 25, 2948, ch 642, 62 Stat. 930, [28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1)(2)].

14. Plaintiff does not receive any benefits, privileges, franchises, or rights from the jurisdiction of the United States Corporation 1871, the municipal corporation State of Florida or Great Britain.

15. Plaintiff has only obligations to bilateral written contracts to which Plaintiff voluntarily, with full disclosure, knowledge, and understanding of the terms, conditions, and obligations thereof would become a party as would

be evidenced by Plaintiff's bona fide signature being affixed to said contracts.

16. Plaintiff cannot use the court rules, United States Code due to the fact that the Court Rules, United States Code, are copyrighted private law of the United States Corporation; as Plaintiff is not a party to a bilateral contract with the older of the copyright which would then authorize Plaintiff's use of said Court Rules, United States Code.

RELEVANT FACTS

17. Plaintiff was seized under color of law, policy, and custom through process issued by UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court cause #05-20251-CR-GOLD.

18. Defendants failed to respond to the Private International Administrative Remedy claim

19. The united States of America, by and through its Public Minister, made a Special Ministerial Visitation upon December 15, 2005 in an effort to determine the nature and cause of Defendant's action under Cause #05-20251-CR-GOLD, and determine whether or not it had any contract with, or tort claim against, an Inhabitant of The united States of America.

20. Defendants failed to identify any nexus of relationship or authority upon which Defendant's could claim a right and cause of action against any Inhabitant.

21. A party identified as "Judge ALAN S. GOLD", acting in the name of, and under color of the authority of

Defendant's dishonored Petitioner's good faith negotiations.

22. Defendants have admitted in Private Administrative process that there is not any lawful authority for the repeated seizure of Plaintiff under color of United States of America process against the fictitious name used by Defendants in UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT #05-20251-CR-GOLD.

23. Declarant hereby intervenes UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, cause number(s) 05-20251-CR-GOLD to prevent any further damages of seizure and unlawful imprisonment of Plaintiff, until it can be determined whether or not Defendants may cause further seizure and imprisonment of Plaintiff after having admitted Plaintiff is not subject to its municipal tribunal actions.

GROUNDS FOR JURISDICTION

The district court has original jurisdiction:

24. Original jurisdiction is founded on the claim of the Plaintiff, as an inhabitant seized and restrained within the jurisdiction of the United States, to rights protected by the Constitution for the united States of America as amended 1791 AD.

25. Original jurisdiction is founded on the basis that the Plaintiff is a Citizen of a foreign state as defined in Pub. L. June 25, 1948, ch 646, 62 Stat. 930 [28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(2)] to the Defendant's action is an action against a foreign Citizen as defined in Pub. L. June 25, 1948, ch 646, 62 Stat. 930 [28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(2)].

26. The issues raised in the Defendant's action raise the controversy as to whether the Defendants, as municipal corporations, have the authority to seize and restrain the liberty of Plaintiff, protected by The Constitution for the united States of America 1791.

27. The district court is conferred original jurisdiction under Article 3 § 2 of The Constitution for The united States of America as Amended 1791 AD regarding all claims which concern the rights protected by The Constitution for the united States of America 1791 AD.

28. The court will please take mandatory judicial notice in the nature of [ER 201 (d)] Pub. L. 94-583, § 4(a), Oct. 21, 1976, 90 Stat. 2892, [28 USC §1603(a)(b)] provides as follows, to wit:

> *For the purpose of this chapter--(a) A "foreign state", except as used in section 1608 of this title, includes a political subdivision of a foreign state or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state as defined in subsection (b). (b) An "agency or instrumentality of a foreign state" means any entity (1) which is a separate legal person, corporate or otherwise, and (3) which is neither a citizen of a State of the United States as defined in section 1332 (c) and (d) of this title, nor created under the laws of any third country.*

And,

29. Pub. L. June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 90, [28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)] to wit;

For purposes of this section and section 1441 of this title - (1) a corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of any State by which it has been incorporated and of any State where it has its principal place of business ....

30. The court shall take notice that the legislature of The United States of America, for the purposes of Defendant's State action, now before the United States district court, deemed a foreign state to include, any separate legal person, corporate or otherwise which is neither a citizen of a State of the United States as defined in section 1332(c) and (d) of this title, nor created under the laws of any third country.

31. The Plaintiff is not a corporation and in-fact, not a citizen of any State of the United States as defined in Pub. L. June 25, 1948, ch 646, 62 Sta. 930, [28 U.S.C. § 1332(c) and (d) nor is the Plaintiff created under the laws of any third country.

32. Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine family, and inhabitant at Ohio Republic, seized and restrained within the jurisdiction of the United States, has exhausted his administrative remedies, and Defendant's have admitted Defendants have no lawful authority for the seizure of the Plaintiff and have caused repeated process against, and seizure of, Plaintiff under color of law, policy, or customer, after having admitted no lawful authority for such seizure exists:

33. THE COURT IS DIRECTED TO TAKE MANDATORY JUDICIAL NOTICE OF THE PUBOIC RECORD AS PROVIDED AT FRE 201 (D).

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT

34. The Declarant, in order to properly present the Declarant's statements in support of the Plaintiff's grounds for jurisdiction, the Plaintiff must provide the court with information regarding the fact that there are two organizations operating under the name United States, each with its own constitution and set of laws.

35. The Declarant, upon person investigation, found that the original jurisdiction of The united States of America, was established by the people on the land in part by the ratification of the Constitution for united States of America as amended AD 1791, which under the delegation of authority of said constitution established the public law or statutes at large for the people as public domain.

36. The Declarant, upon personal investigation, found that in 1871, the 41st Congress Section III ch. 61 & 62, authorized the establishment of the private municipal corporation of the District of Columbia to be commonly known as the United States, the federal corporation, which said corporation adopted the text of the original Constitution for The united States of America as amended through Article in amendment 14, as a private copyrighted bylaw of said corporation, to be known as the United States Federal Constitution. The United States Federal Corporation, under the authority of its charter, adopted in part the text of the public law and statutes established under the original jurisdiction of The united States of America AD 1791 as the private copyrighted United States Code.

37. As the court can now plainly see, with two organizations operating with similar names, one public and one private, the question arises under what substantive system of law is the Defendant operating, public or private, and what substantive system of law is being applied to the conduct of the Plaintiff?

38. The additional question arises is, when one who is elected to office and submits an official oath, to which organization, constitution and laws, is said party swearing or affirming to uphold, that of the original jurisdiction established by the people on the land of The united States of America AD 1791 or that of the private United States Federal Corporation established in 1871.

39. The Plaintiff must also address the issue of the safeguards of liberty as provide by the constitutions and laws of either the original jurisdiction of the people of The united States of America AD 1791 or the private United States Federal Corporation 1871 or the private United States Federal Corporation 1871 and its franchise political subdivision state corporations.

40. The Declarant on personal investigation found that although the term "Citizen" in a general common meaning and usage means a certain status to wit:

"One of the natural born sovereign People, possessing and entitled to the enjoyment of all rights, privileges and immunities enumerated or un-enumerated in The constitution for united States of America AD 1791, which can be enjoyed by anyone of the sovereign people, protected by The constitution and laws of The united States of America AD 1791.

41. The term "citizen in the specific, limited meaning and usage in the statutes, means a certain 'status' totally different than the general common meaning and usage to wit: PL 85-554, 72 Sta. 415. July 25, 1958 [28 USC § 1332].

"For the purpose of this section and section 1441 of this title, a corporation shall be deemed a citizen of any state by which it has been incorporated and of the state where it has its principal place of business. "

42. As the court can plainly see, there are at least two meanings for the term "citizen". The general meaning and usage of the term "Citizen" refers to one of the natural born people who is entitled to assert personal inherent liberty and immunities, which are Protected fro abridgment under color of state law and by The Constitution and Laws of "The united States of America AD 1791 and the specific, limited meaning and usage in the statutes for the term "citizen" refers to a corporate entity which has no rights protected by The Constitution and Laws of The united States of American AD 1791, established under the authority of any state with only privilege and franchise created by statutes regulation.

43. The Declarant requests the court to take mandatory judicial notice of, Pub. L; June 25th, 1948, ch 645, 62 Stat. 696, [18 USC & 242] to wit:

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom (public policy) willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the constitution or law of the United States (The constitution or laws of The united

States of America AD 1791)...shall be fined not more than $1000 dollars or imprisoned not more than one year or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years or both and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

44. The Declarant request that the court take notice that the only qualification required of the criminal statute for the Plaintiff to be protected from being deprived of any of the Plaintiff's inherent liberties/rights under color of statute, regulation, ordinance, custom (public policy) of any state, including Ohio State, is that the Plaintiff need only inhabit the state. The Plaintiffs nationality, or place or birth is not an issue, the Plaintiff's protection against deprivation of the Plaintiffs rights under color of law requires that the Plaintiff in seeking protecting simply inhabits, any one of the several states.

45. The Plaintiff, in fact, meets the requirement of being an inhabitant of one of the several states, and is therefore entitled to protection against being deprived of any inherent right, privilege or immunity under color of the laws, or public policy of United States of America or the private copyrighted laws/bylaws of the corporation of United States of America.

46. Defendants have admitted Defendant(s) did fraudulently use the appellation of the Plaintiff's name in order to deliberately apply the term "citizen" within the statutory meaning of the term as the term "citizen" applies to corporations, in order to mislead the court and the Plaintiff regarding the true status of the Plaintiff, a natural born inhabitant on the land of The united States of America AD 1791 currently an inhabitant on the land at

The State of Ohio, in order to deprive the Plaintiff of any or all inherent rights, privileges, and immunities protected by The constitution and laws of The united States of America AD 1791 under color of law/bylaw and public policy of the United States of America, such acts are considered crimes which include but are not limited to:

a) Deprivation of rights under color of law.

b) Conspiracy against rights.

c) Perjury in the first degree.

d) Official misconduct.

A public servant is guilty of official misconduct if, with intent to obtain or to deprive another party of a lawful right or privilege..

e) Fraud by :false certification".

f) Harassment

g) Unlawful imprisonment.

h) Leading organized crime.

i) Use of proceeds of criminal profiteering-controlling enterprise or realty-conspiracy or attempt.

j) Extortion.

k) Obtaining signature by deception or duress.

l) Coercion

m) Kidnapping

n) Plaintiff is not a proper party to the Defendant's action.

o) The Plaintiff, inhabitant on the land of The united States of America AD 1791 has the inherent right not to be compelled involuntarily into any contractual agreement creating an obligation for compelled performance.

p) The corporation of United States of America is prohibited under article 1 § 10, articles in amendment 9, 10, and 14 of The constitution for the united States of America AD 1791 from making or enforcing any laws compelling the Plaintiff involuntarily into any contractual agreement creating and obligation for compelled performance.

q) The Plaintiff is not a party to any written bilateral contract voluntarily signed by the Plaintiff creating a contractual obligation with the Plaintiff wherein the Plaintiff voluntarily agreed to waive the Plaintiff's right not to be compelled involuntarily into any contractual agreement creating an obligation for compelled performance.

r) Defendants have admitted Plaintiff is not a party to any written bilateral contract voluntarily signed by the Plaintiff creating a contractual obligation with the Defendant wherein the Plaintiff voluntarily agreed to change Plaintiff's status from that of an inhabitant on the land of The united States of America AD 1791 with

endowed inherent rights to that of a corporate citizen of the municipal corporation United States of America, with only statutory privilege, authorizing the Defendant to change the Plaintiff's status.

s) *Defendants have admitted Plaintiff is not a party to any written bilateral contract creating a contractual obligation between the Plaintiff and the corporation United States of American under cause number 05-20251-CR-GOLD.*

The Plaintiff is not a party of said case.

CONCLUSION

47. For the reasons stated above, and based upon the exhibits attached hereto and evidence, which is a matter of record, the Plaintiff, is entitled to dismiss the Defendant's action.

Further Declarant says not.

Given under my hand and seal this 1st day of September, 2006 anno Domini.

The united States of America
By:

/s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
Anthony, Public Minister
Declarant

APPENDIX L

NOTICE OF PROTEST

To: Alberto Gonzales, Fiduciary,
Office of attorney General
Condalezza Rice, Fiduciary
Office of the Secretary of State
United States (41st Congress, session III .ch. 62, 1871)
City of Washington
District of Columbia

Private International Claim#

Columbia County	)	
The State of Ohio	)	Verified Notice
United States of America	)	

Greeting,

Affiant, Anthony Lewis of the Jerdine family, of age to contract and competent to witness, states that the facts contained herein are true, correct, complete, certain and not misleading to the best of the Affiants first hand knowledge ad belief, under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of Ohio and the United States of America.

You are herby placed upon Notice, in a timely manner in the spirit of good faith, with clean hands, Nunc Pro Tunc, of the breach of Fiduciary Duties by officers, Agents, Assigns or successors of your corporate Governing bodies under the Franchise/License Under which US District Courts -Southern

District courts of Florida is operating as a corporate defacto extension of United States.

Take NOTICE of the evidence of Foreign Status/expatriation/formal renunciation of (Anthony-Lewis Jerdine), an ambassador of Sovereign American Nationale (in the nature of the principles articulated at Fifteen (15) statutes at large, [cl. 249-250, pp.223-224] July 27, AD 1868), by Lawful Public Notice out of necessity as the world has witnessed, entitled "Declaration in the Nature of an Affidavit of Necessity", "Declaration in the of an affidavit of Independence", Declaration of Allegiance" and "Declaration in the Nature of an Affidavit of Declaration of Independence by Public Notice", Certified copies attached hereto.

You are hereby NOTICED in a timely and effective manner, in the spirit of good faith with clean hands, out of necessity Nunc Pro Tunc, of the Fact that, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT-Southern district of Florida at Miami by and through R. ALEXANDER ACOSTA- US ATTORNEY has seized, transferred and continues current seizure of Anthony- Lewis of the Jerdine family, under its Agency known as the BUREAU OF PRISONS, contrary to the provisions in the Law as articulated in your foreign Sovereign Immunities act, by way of the following fictions name(s) : JERINDE, ANTHONY (ANTHONY L. JERDINE) which may appear optically and phonetically similar under cause #(06-20063-CIV-MARTINEZ), and US MARSHALLS REGISTER # (64257-004).

You are hereby NOTICED in a timely and effective manner in the spirit of good faith with clean hands, out of necessity, Nunc Pro Tunc, that Anthony - Lewis of the Jerdine family has never been lawfully served notice of any change, not convicted whereas the UNITED STATES

SUPREME COURT is the body within your venue having original jurisdiction in matters involving Ambassadors, Public Ministers, and consuls involving Foreign affairs.

NOTICE: the principle of Law articulated in the nature of "your" United States Code, title Forty -two, sections one thousand nine hundred and eighty-six, one thousand nine hundred and eighty- five[T 42 UsS.C. §§ 1986, 1985] and title Eighteen, sections two hundred and forty-two, two - hundred forty- three and four [T. 42 U.S.C. §§242,241,4] are binding upon you by way of your Oath of Office contract. In the event (Anthony- Lewis Jerdine) is further damaged as a result of the act, actions and or failure or refusal to act by each respondent hereto, (Anthony- Lewis Jerdine) provides this Notice of intent to claim the Official Bond or surety of, or under whish each respondent to this Private International administration NOTICE OF PROTEST operates.

NOTICE: You are herby placed on NOTICE that you must address all communications with (Anthony- Lewis Jerdine), EXACTLY using the appellation and mailing Location as it appears above, in the heading of this NOTICE. Any attempts to communicate not addressed as required will be prima facie evidence of fraud and refused for cause pursuant to the principles of Law articulated in the nature of your United States Code, Title Eighteen, Sections One Thousand three Hundred forty -six, one thousand three hundred forty -two, one thousand three hundred forty -one [t. 18 U.S.C. §§1346,1342,1341] as you have actual Notice of the correct information as it pertains to Anthony - Lewis of the Jerdine Family.

You are hereby granted (10) days to respond due to the exigent circumstances of seizure, and continuing seizures of the corpus of (Anthony- Lewis: Jerdine) without lawful

authority. Your failure or refusal to respond will be your stipulation to your willful, wanton and reckless disregard of Law and your duties as Fiduciary, the performances of which are incorporated in your Oath of Office Contract, performances of which secured by your Official Bond or surety to compel the performance in good faith of those acting in official capacity under the color of the laws, policies and customs of the United States and contrary to the principles of Law articulated herein.

FURTHER AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT

Whereas, in the nature of the Law as articulates in the United States Constitution as adopted by laws of the municipal corporate government of the District of Columbia, Known as United Stats (41st Congress, Sess. III, Cl. 62, 1871) in Article III, Section 2 states that: "in all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consds .... The supreme court have original jurisdiction ..." you are herby NOTICED to initiate and secure the liberty of (Anthony - Lewis: Jerdnie) forthwith from current, and all possible future seizer(s), by officer, agents, assigns or successor, of your corporate governing bodies, under Franchise//license of STATE OF Florida and or any State(s) of, United States District Court-southern District of Florida, at Miami, Bureau of Prisons are operating as a corporate territorial extension of United States at federal Correction Institutions, Elkton, Ohio United States.

NOTICE TO RESPONDANT(S) AND JUDICIAL OFFICER(S)

Pursuant to your Fiduciary duties, the performance of which is incorporated in you oath of office contact, performance of which is secured by your official Bond or surety to compel the performance in good faith those acting in

official capacity, under color of laws, polices and customs of the United States by way of membership in the United States Bar association and Contrary to the principle in law articulated herein above.

Thank you in advance for your valuable consideration and prompt attention to this important matter.

Executed and dated this 4th day of July, 2006.

L.S. /s/ Anthony-Lewis: Jerdine
Affiant Anthony-Lewis of the Jerdine Family